

13. What concerns do you have, if any, about a diminished NCUA onsite presence, and can these be mitigated?

14. What impact, positive or negative, do you anticipate this future examination program strategy will have on your credit union and its operation?

15. Will moving offsite create any noticeable change in credit unions' ability to provide services to members, particularly during major disruptions, like pandemics?

16. Are there resiliency tests that can be performed by examiners offsite that could not be performed when examiners are onsite? If so, please detail them.

17. If rebuilding the examination process from scratch, how might you redesign what is currently done today in order to reduce the burden on credit unions and/or minimize time that examiners need to be onsite at credit unions?

18. What new or emerging technologies could enable the NCUA to examine a credit union with less time onsite?

19. Are video and telecommunications capabilities sufficient to maintain good lines of communication between examiners and credit union management and officials with reduced in-person meeting opportunities? What other methods of communication or communication protocols would support quality communications between the credit union and examination staff?

20. What types of artificial intelligence and/or machine learning techniques are you currently using or anticipate using?

21. Does the NCUA have regulations/policies that are sufficiently flexible to allow you to leverage various technological advances such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, process robotics, Fintech, Regtech, and Suptech etc.?

22. Do the current regulations/policies create unnecessary hurdles or burdens with respect to adopting technology? Are there ways we can update our regulations/policies to help facilitate a greater use of technology?

23. Do you feel comfortable using the NCUA's secure file transfer portal as a means to transfer data electronically, including personally identifiable information and confidential credit union data, to NCUA staff? If not, please provide details regarding your concerns and recommendations on ways the NCUA could mitigate these concerns.

24. What issues are unique to smaller institutions regarding the use and implementation of innovative products, services, or processes that the NCUA should consider? Additionally, by

moving to an offsite exam posture, will this negatively affect small credit unions that may not have the technology required to transmit requested documentation? Are you exploring any types of services, products or technologies to offer to your members in the future?

25. With respect to the future examination model, should the NCUA consider alternative exam approaches for smaller credit unions?

26. Are there better ways for the NCUA to support your financial inclusion and financial education mission through the use of technology? Additionally, are there better ways for the NCUA to use technology to help low-income designated credit unions and minority depository institutions to better serve their members?

27. Do you feel there are circumstances that would disqualify or preclude a credit union from participating in this examination model where the majority of work is completed offsite?

28. What documentation and measures should be collected and used to assess a credit union's financial education efforts or programs?

29. Are there better ways for the NCUA to receive important contextual information regarding how you serve the low-income, underserved, and unbanked communities in your field of membership?

30. What baseline data protection and privacy safeguards would enable credit unions to comply with consumer protection statutes and federal/state law when sharing data for remote examinations?

31. How could an offsite posture affect the oversight of consumer financial protection and BSA/anti-money laundering laws and regulations at your credit union? What changes should the NCUA make to address your concerns?

32. All technology is coupled with internal and external security risks. As credit unions remain diligent in addressing these risks, what can the NCUA do to support credit unions' security posture?

33. What cybersecurity challenges do you see with the NCUA moving to this future examination model?

34. Are there digital banking activities or issues that are not covered by this RFI that the NCUA should address?

35. In response to the pandemic, the NCUA moved to an offsite posture. Did you participate in an exam during this time?

a. From your perspective, what has worked well?

b. What exam steps could continue to be completed offsite after we return to an onsite posture?

c. Were there parts of the exam, during the offsite posture that did not work well?

36. Are there issues the NCUA should consider in light of changes in the banking system that have occurred in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?

Commenters are also encouraged to discuss any other relevant issues they believe the NCUA should consider with respect to this examination study.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on June 25, 2020.

Gerard Poliquin,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2020-14129 Filed 6-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7535-01-P

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Endowment for the Humanities

Agency Information Collection Request; 30-Day Public Comment Request

AGENCY: National Endowment for the Humanities; National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) is seeking Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the information collection described below. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, NEH is requesting comments from all interested individuals and organizations on this proposed collection.

DATES: Please submit comments by July 31, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Timothy Carrigan, Chief Funding Opportunity Officer, Office of Grant Management, National Endowment for the Humanities: 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20506, or tcarrigan@neh.gov; or 202-606-8377.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NEH first published notice of its intent to seek OMB approval for this information

collection in the **Federal Register** of April 13, 2020 (85 FR 20531) and allowed 60 days for public comment. The agency received one public comment, dated April 13, 2020, which expressed general concern about high taxes and doubt about the benefit of this information collection to the taxpayer. NEH acknowledged the comment but determined that it did not call for any change to the planned information collection since the opinion expressed was of a general nature and did not pertain to any specific aspects of the information collection. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comment.

Overview of This Information Collection

Type of Review: Revision of an existing information collection.

Title of Information Collection: General Clearance Authority to Develop Grantee Survey Instruments for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Abstract: The National Endowment for the Humanities is seeking to revise its general clearance authority to develop survey instruments for recipients of its grant programs. The NEH regularly monitors its grants, relying primarily on data obtained in performance reports. In many instances, outcomes are not readily observable during the one- to three-year period of performance. The clearance to collect data from grant recipients beyond the period of performance is essential to the NEH's ability to assess its programs systemically and to measure progress in achieving the goals articulated in the agency's strategic plan.

The proposed revision adjusts the overall burden estimate from 580 to 615 hours, to reflect the anticipated change in the number of respondents from 1,160 to 1,230. The estimated time per response remains unchanged.

OMB Number: 3136-0139.

Affected Public: NEH grant recipients.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Total Respondents: 1,230.

Total Responses: 1,230.

Estimated Time per Response: 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 615 hours.

Request for Comments

The public is invited to comment on all aspects of this ICR, including: (a) Whether the proposed 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 the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information, to search data sources, to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: June 25, 2020.

Caitlin Cater,

Attorney-Advisor, National Endowment for the Humanities.

[FR Doc. 2020-14096 Filed 6-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-293; NRC-2020-0136]

Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC; Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: License amendment request; opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order imposing procedures.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of an amendment to Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-35, issued to Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC for the decommissioning of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station (Pilgrim). The amendment would amend the Pilgrim Physical Security Plan and amend License Condition 3.G, "Physical Protection." The proposed revised Physical Security Plan would integrate the existing Physical Security Plan's Appendix D. Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC indicated that this proposed appendix provides the

security requirements for the new Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation that is currently being built in the Owner Controlled Area outside of the existing Pilgrim Protected Area. According to Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC, the Security Training and Qualification Plan and the Safeguards Contingency Plan are included in the proposed revised Physical Security Plan but remain unchanged from the existing Physical Security Plan. The NRC proposes to determine that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. Because the amendment request contains safeguards information (SGI), an order imposes procedures to obtain access to SGI for contention preparation. **DATES:** Comments must be filed by July 31, 2020. A request for a hearing must be filed by August 31, 2020. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SGI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by July 13, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Website: Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2020-0136. Address questions about NRC docket IDs in *Regulations.gov* to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; email: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

CONTACT section of this document.

- Mail comments to: Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, ATTN: Program Management, Announcements and Editing Staff.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amy M. Snyder, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-6822; email: Amy.Snyder@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2020-0136 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this