

resource to field professionals, and to itself

- A new public policy approach is needed: Funding should be provided for a public safety initiative to prepare hospitals for catastrophic and hazardous events. Sustain-ability of equipment and services should also be addressed in the policy. Red Cross is an example.

- Public health and acute care medicine need to be integrated with each other, for terrorism and for general catastrophic disasters, and then integrated with law enforcement and emergency management.

- The need to keep current with regulatory issues was not discussed in the workgroup; need to show have addressed medical information that is out-of-date in documents. For example, still keep stating will use intra-muscular Valium for organophosphate seizure control although it is no longer used. This is an example of the type of information sharing that needs to be achieved.

- Comment: The Red Cross does not receive federal funding. It is funded strictly by voluntary contributions from individuals.

- Emergency Management/State and Local Agencies Workgroup Summary:

- NDPO has a coordination role for national preparedness. To perform this role, all federal agencies need to adopt and follow the National Contingency Plan (NCP). It is a tried and tested plan.

- All federal agencies should adopt, educate about, and practice the ICS system

- All participants must pursue planning efforts at the local level, such as LEPCs

- NDPO needs to have its own internal strategic plan, and align itself to accomplish the plan.

- DOJ and FEMA need to demonstrate a commitment to the NDPO. High visibility should be given to it throughout the transition period.

- Core interagency operation and leadership staff should be funded, and encouragement given to other agencies to also fund. It is critical for this to be done now.

- Pressure is needed from the top down to get the NDPO funded.

Following the presentations, NDPO Administrator Thomas Kinnally asked the Advisory Group whether they wanted to prioritize the points they had made, or pass them all forward to the Attorney General. A comment was made to identify the overlapping issues and concepts, and then compress the list. The list would be organized as to what the plenary group expects the NDPO to do, and what the group expects itself to do. In the next few weeks the NDPO

staff would prepare an executive summary and include all critical issues identified by the Advisory Group, which would then be forwarded to the Attorney General and the NDPO federal partners. It was acknowledged that little could be accomplished in the absence of NDPO funding. In the interim, Chairman Stan McKinney would meet with the Attorney General on September 28 to brief her on the Advisory Group's recommendations.

The Group then took a break. Following the break, Chairman Stan McKinney made closing remarks and the floor was opened to comments from the public. A presentation was made by Christian Sommade of the Centech Group, Arlington, VA, on European versus the U.S. Approach on Domestic Preparedness."

Following some discussion on scheduling the next Advisory Group meeting, Chairman Stan McKinney thanked all of the participants and adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.

Dated: December 4, 2000.

**Allison Dunham,**

*Administrative Officer, NDPO.*

Dated: December 4, 2000.

**Stan M. McKinney,**

*Chairman, State and Local Advisory Group for the NDPO.*

These minutes will be formally considered by the Advisory Group at its next meeting, and any corrections or notations will be incorporated in the minutes of that meeting.

*Responsible Federal Official:* Thomas G. Kinnally, Administrator, NDPO.

**ADDRESSES:** The National Domestic Preparedness Office, JEH FBI Building, Room 5214, 935 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20535.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Allison Dunham, NDPO, (202) 324-9037.

[FR Doc. 00-32818 Filed 12-22-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-02-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Intent To Seek Approval To Establish a New Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request clearance of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of

Section 3506(c) (2) (A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting that OMB approve clearance of this collection for no longer than three years.

**DATES:** Written comments on this notice must be received by February 26, 2001 to be assured of consideration.

Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Contact Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230; telephone (703) 292-7556; or send email to splimpto@nsf.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday. You also may obtain a copy of the data collection instrument and instructions from Ms. Plimpton.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* National Science Foundation Information Technology Innovation Survey.

*OMB Number:* 3145-NEW.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* Not applicable.

*Type of Request:* Intent to seek approval to establish a new information collection.

*Abstract:*

*Proposed Project:* The NSF plans to survey a nationally representative sample of about 3,750 U. S. businesses in selected manufacturing and service-sector industries. The survey is designed to collect information about the planning for and impact of technological innovation. Using Web and Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing technologies, firms will be asked about their strategic planning, use of technology, innovation activities based on information technology, factors influencing the decision to innovate, and the costs and expected benefits of information technology based innovation.

*Use of the Information:* The information will be used by NSF to: (1) Develop nationally representative profile of corporate information technology innovators and uses; (2) provide the means for comparative analyses among similar national studies; and (3) provide data for use by policymakers to assist in understanding the development and use of information technology as they relate to formulating

technology policy, regulatory reform, and other issues.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12 minutes per response.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit.

*Estimated Number of Responses Per Form:* One.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 750 hours—3,750 respondents at 12 minutes per response.

*Frequency of Responses:* Once.

## Comments

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall 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 on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (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.

Dated: December 19, 2000.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-32793 Filed 12-22-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-354]

### PSEG Nuclear LLC and Atlantic City Electric Company (Hope Creek Generating Station); Order Extending the Effectiveness of the Approval of the Transfer of License and Conforming Amendment

#### I

PSEG Nuclear LLC and the Atlantic City Electric Company (ACE) are the joint owners of the Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS), located in Salem County, New Jersey. They hold Facility Operating License No. NPF-57, issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) on July 25, 1986, pursuant to Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 50). Under this license, PSEG Nuclear LLC (currently

owner of 95 percent of HCGS) is authorized to act as agent for ACE (owner of the remaining 5 percent of HCGS) and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility. It is noted that on August 21, 2000, the majority share of the HCGS license was transferred from the Public Service Electric and Gas Company to PSEG Nuclear LLC. This license transfer had previously been approved by an Order dated February 16, 2000.

#### II

By Order dated April 21, 2000, the Commission approved the transfer of the license for the HCGS, to the extent it is held by ACE, to PSEG Nuclear LLC. By its terms, the Order of April 21, 2000, becomes null and void if the license transfer is not completed by December 31, 2000, unless upon application and for good cause shown, such date is extended by the Commission.

#### III

By letter dated October 10, 2000, PSEG Nuclear LLC, on behalf of itself and ACE, submitted a request for an extension of the effectiveness of the Order of April 21, 2000, such that it would remain effective until December 31, 2001. According to the submittal, certain regulatory approvals in New Jersey that are needed before ACE can transfer its nuclear interests, which include interests in other facilities in addition to HCGS, are still pending. The submittal states that while the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (BPU) has approved the transfer of the ACE interests, it has not yet issued a final order covering all aspects of the transaction. Additionally, an appeal of the BPU decision in the Public Service Electric and Gas restructuring case that challenges the BPU's implementation of the deregulation legislation in New Jersey has been filed. The submittal states that this situation has caused ACE to delay the closing on the transfer of its nuclear assets.

The NRC staff has considered the submittal of October 10, 2000, and has determined that good cause has been shown to extend the effectiveness of the Order of April 21, 2000, as requested.

#### IV

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 161b and 161i of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2201(b) and 2201(i), *It is Hereby Ordered* that the effectiveness of the Order of April 21, 2000, described herein is extended such that if the subject license transfer

from ACE to PSEG Nuclear LLC referenced above is not consummated by December 31, 2001, the Order of April 21, 2000, shall become null and void, unless upon application and for good cause shown, such date is further extended.

This Order is effective upon issuance.

For further details with respect to this Order, see the submittal dated October 10, 2000, which may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, MD, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov>.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of December 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00-32830 Filed 12-22-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a new guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Regulatory Guide 1.186, "Guidance and Examples for Identifying 10 CFR 50.2 Design Bases," provides guidance to licensees and applicants on the definition of design bases as they are defined in the NRC's regulations in 10 CFR 50.2.

Comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection or downloading at the NRC's web site at [WWW.NRC.GOV](http://WWW.NRC.GOV) under Regulatory Guides and in NRC's Electronic Reading Room (ADAMS System) at the same site; Regulatory