

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

**DATES:** Written comments should be received by February 7, 2003, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments regarding the information collection and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rm. 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292-7556 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov).

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* 2003 and 2005 Survey of Scientific and Engineering Research Facilities.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* August 31, 2002.

*Type of Request:* Intent to seek approval to reinstate, with revisions, an information collection for three years.

*Proposed Project:* The National Science Foundation Survey of Scientific and Engineering Research Facilities is a Congressionally mandated (Pub. L. 99-159), biennial survey that has been conducted since 1986. The survey collects data on the amount, condition, and costs of the physical facilities used to conduct science and engineering research. It was expected by Congress that this survey would provide the data necessary to describe the status and needs of science and engineering research facilities and to formulate appropriate solutions to documented needs. During the 1999 and 2001 survey cycles, data were collected from a population of approximately 600 research-performing colleges and universities. This survey population was supplemented with approximately 250 nonprofit biomedical research institutions receiving research support from the National Institutes of Health. During the 2001 cycle, a very limited survey consisting of two questions was fielded in order to allow the National Science Foundation to focus on updating and redesigning the survey. Through this extensive redesign effort, a

new section has been added to the survey requesting information on the computing and networking capacity at the surveyed institutions, an increasingly important part of the infrastructure for science and engineering research. Other important changes include the deletion of a question on the adequacy of research space, the deletion of the Large Facilities Follow-up Survey, the additional collection of data on individual construction projects and the addition of a more detailed question on how research space is divided among laboratories, laboratory support space, and office space.

*Use of the Information:* Analysis of the Facilities Survey data will provide updated information on the status of scientific and engineering research facilities. The information can be used by Federal policy makers, planners, and budget analysts in making policy decisions, as well as by academic officials, the scientific/engineering establishment, and state agencies that fund universities.

*Burden on the Public:* The Facilities Survey will be sent by mail to approximately 600 academic institutions and 250 nonprofit research organizations and hospitals. The completion time per academic institution is expected to average 30 hours and the completion time per research organization/hospitals is expected to average 5 hours. Assuming a 90% response rate, this would result in an estimated burden of 16,200 hours for academic institutions and 1,125 hours for nonprofit research organizations/hospitals.

Dated: December 4, 2002.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 02-31006 Filed 12-6-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

---

## NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**TIME AND DATE:** 2 PM, Wednesday, December 11, 2002.

**PLACE:** Washington Hilton & Towers Hotel, 1919 Connecticut Avenue NW, Cabinet Room, Concourse Level, Washington, DC 20009.

**STATUS:** Open/Closed.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Jeffrey T. Bryson, General Counsel/Secretary, (202) 220-2372.

### Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes: September 10, 2002 Regular Meeting
- III. Audit Committee Meeting 11/18/02
- IV. Treasurer's Report
- V. Executive Directors Report
- VI. Executive Session (CLOSED)
  - A. Personnel Committee Meeting 11/15/02
- VII. Adjournment

**Jeffrey T. Bryson,**

*General Counsel Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 02-31142 Filed 12-5-02; 11:17 am]

**BILLING CODE 7570-01-M**

---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287]

### Duke Energy Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) to withdraw its December 6, 2002, application for proposed amendments to Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55 for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 located in Seneca, South Carolina.

The proposed amendments would have revised Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.16, "Control Room Area Cooling System (CRACS)," that currently requires entry into TS 3.0.3 when two trains of CRACS are inoperable. The proposed amendments would have eliminated the required entry into TS 3.0.3 and would have allowed 6 hours to restore the operability of one train.

The Commission had previously issued a notice of consideration of issuance of amendment published in the **Federal Register** on February 5, 2002 (67 FR 5326). However, by letter dated November 26, 2002, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 6, 2002, and the licensee's letter dated November 26, 2002, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public

Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams/html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737 or by email to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of December 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Leonard N. Olshan,**

*Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 02-31002 Filed 12-6-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-309-OM & 72-30-OM; ASLBP No. 03-806-01-OM]

### Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 FR 28710 (1972), and sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717, 2.721, and 2.772(j) of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established to preside over the following proceeding:

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station.

This Board is being established pursuant to a November 15, 2002, petition to intervene and request for hearing submitted by the State of Maine. The petition was filed in response to an NRC staff "Order Modifying Licenses (Effective Immediately)" published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 65150 (October 23, 2002)). The order requires licensees who currently store, or who have near-term plans to store, spent nuclear fuel in an independent spent fuel storage installation to maintain the security procedures specified in attachment 2 to the order.

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

Ann M. Young, Chair, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Richard F. Cole, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Thomas D. Murphy, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

All correspondence, documents, and other materials shall be filed with the administrative judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701.

Issued in Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of December, 2002.

**G. Paul Bollwerk, III,**

*Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.*

[FR Doc. 02-31003 Filed 12-6-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-261]

### Carolina Power & Light Company; H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) part 55, section 55.59(c) for Facility Operating License No. DPR-23, issued to Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee), for operation of the H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2 (HBRSEP2), located in Darlington County, South Carolina. As required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee on a one-time basis from the schedular requirements of 10 CFR 55.59(c) for conducting the licensed operator requalification annual operating test and biennial comprehensive written examination at HBRSEP2.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 11, 2002.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would extend the date for the licensee to complete the licensed operator requalification annual operating test and biennial comprehensive written examinations at HBRSEP2. The proposed action would extend the date for completing the examinations from December 31, 2002, to March 31, 2003, therefore extending the examination schedules by 3 months

over the schedules required by 10 CFR 55.59(c). This proposed action is needed to allow HBRSEP2 to complete an unusually heavy workload associated with a plant refueling outage and a power uprate, including conducting associated additional training and modifying the plant-specific simulator, in a timely and safe fashion without undue hardship to plant personnel and licensed plant operators.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, as set forth below, that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the extension of the operator requalification examinations from December 31, 2002, to March 31, 2003.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

#### Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for HBRSEP2.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

On November 26, 2002, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, regarding the environmental