

**Authority**

Issuance of permits and permit modifications, as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543) (ESA), is based on a finding that such permits/modifications: (1) Are applied for in good faith; (2) would not operate to the disadvantage of the listed species which are the subject of the permits; and (3) are consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA. Authority to take listed species is subject to conditions set forth in the permits. Permits and modifications are issued in accordance with and are subject to the ESA and NMFS regulations governing listed fish and wildlife permits (50 CFR parts 222–226).

All statements and opinions contained in the permit action summaries are those of the applicant and do not necessarily reflect the views of NMFS.

**Species Covered in this Notice**

The following species, runs, and evolutionarily significant units (ESU's) are covered in this notice:

*Sea Turtles*

Endangered leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*).

*Fish*

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*): Threatened Snake River (SnR) fall, threatened SnR spring/summer, endangered upper Columbia River (UCR) spring.

Sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*): Endangered SnR.

Steelhead (*O. mykiss*): Endangered UCR.

**Permits and Modifications Issued**

Notice was published on April 26, 1999 (64 FR 20266), that OCFWRU had applied for a modification to permit 1136. Modification 1 to permit 1136 was issued on April 13, 2000, and authorizes OCFWRU to capture fish at two additional locations: Little Goose Dam on the Snake River and John Day Dam on the Columbia River. Modification 1 also authorizes OCFWRU annual takes of juvenile naturally produced and artificially propagated UCR spring chinook salmon. Lethal take and indirect mortalities of juvenile naturally produced and artificially propagated UCR spring chinook salmon associated with the research are also authorized. A second notice of receipt was published on May 13, 1999 (64 FR 25873) because NMFS had received an amended modification request seeking an increase in the annual take of ESA-

listed fish associated with the research. The additional take is authorized to accommodate expected increased abundance of some species in 1999. Modification 1 is valid for the duration of permit 1136, which expires on December 31, 2000.

Notice was published on March 25, 1999 (64 FR 14432), that GCPUD had applied for a modification to scientific research permit 1141. Modification 1 to permit 1141 was issued on May 5, 1999 (64 FR 25873) but did not include annual takes of UCR spring chinook salmon. Permit 1141 authorizes GCPUD annual takes of adult and juvenile naturally produced and artificially propagated UCR steelhead associated with four scientific research studies at or in the vicinity of Wanapum and Priest Rapids Dams located on the upper Columbia River in Washington. The purpose of Study 1 is to monitor outmigrating adult and juvenile steelhead condition, survival, and travel time relative to spill effectiveness at the dams. The purpose of Study 2 is to substantiate and document hydroacoustic accuracy at Wanapum Dam. The purpose of Study 3 is to evaluate the relative abundance of the fish fauna inhabiting the Priest Rapids project area. The purpose of Study 4 is to assess the survival of juvenile, artificially propagated, UCR steelhead as they migrate past Wanapum and Priest Rapids Dams. Notice is hereby given that NMFS issued an amendment to permit 1141 on April 13, 2000. The permit amendment authorizes GCPUD annual takes of adult and juvenile naturally produced and artificially propagated UCR spring chinook salmon associated with Studies 1 and 3. The permit amendment also authorizes the take of ESA-listed salmon and steelhead associated with Study 3 annually for the duration of the permit. The amendment is valid for the duration of permit 1141, which expires on December 31, 2002.

Notice was published on October 22, 1999 (64 FR 57069), that PD-SWFSC had applied for a scientific research permit. Permit 1227 was issued on April 18, 2000, and authorizes takes of leatherback turtles in Monterey Bay, CA as part of a stock identification and movement study. Permit 1227 expires on December 31, 2002.

Dated: April 23, 2000.

**Wanda L. Cain,**

Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 00–10796 Filed 4–28–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–F**

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION****Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request—Follow-Up Activities for Product-Related Injuries**

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the Commission announces that it has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for an extension of the existing approval of collections of information conducted during follow-up activities for product-related injuries.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before May 31, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be captioned "Product-Related Injuries" and mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for CPSC, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503. Copies of comments also may be mailed to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; delivered to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 502, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland 20814, telephone (301) 504–0800; telefacsimiled to (301) 504–0127; or emailed to [cpsc-os@cpsc.gov](mailto:cpsc-os@cpsc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR A COPY**

**CONTACT:** Linda Glatz, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207; 301–504–0416 ext. 2226 or by email to [lglatz@cpsc.gov](mailto:lglatz@cpsc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****1. Background**

Section 5(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2054(a)) requires the Commission to collect information related to the cause and prevention of death, injury, and illness associated with consumer products, and to conduct continuing studies and investigations of deaths, injuries, diseases, and economic losses resulting from accidents involving consumer products. The Commission uses this information to support rulemaking proceedings, development and improvement of voluntary standards, information and education programs, and administrative and judicial proceedings to remove unsafe products from the marketplace and consumers' homes.

Persons who have been involved with, or who have witnessed, incidents associated with consumer products are an important source of information

about deaths, injuries, and illnesses resulting from such incidents. From consumer complaints, newspaper accounts, death certificates, hospital emergency room reports, and other sources, the Commission selects a limited number of accidents for investigation. These investigations may involve face-to-face or telephone interviews with accident victims, witnesses, or other persons having relevant knowledge.

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) (PRA), the Commission obtained the approval of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for this collection of information (OMB control No. 3041-0029). The current approval expires May 31, 2000. The extension is requested through May 31, 2003.

In the **Federal Register** of January 4, 2000 (65 FR 290), the Consumer Product Safety Commission published a notice, required by the PRA, to announce the agency's intention to seek extension of approval of this collection of information, through May 31, 2003. The estimated burden of this collection of information is 752 hours per year lower than the burden estimated for the currently approved collection. The Commission received one comment, from representatives of seven manufacturers of all-terrain vehicles (ATV's). A summary of this comment, and the Commission's response, is provided later in this notice.

## 2. Additional Details About the Request for Approval of a Collection of Information

*Agency address:* Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

*Title of information collection:* Follow-Up Activities for Product-Related Injuries.

*Type of request:* Extension of approval.

*Frequency of collection:* One time for each respondent.

*General description of respondents:* Persons who have been involved in, have witnessed, or otherwise have knowledge of incidents associated with consumer products.

*Estimated number of respondents:* Total 8,500: 1,600 subjects of in-depth investigations (IDI's) to be interviewed by telephone and 400 IDI's to be interviewed at the incident site; 2,500 persons who fill out forms on the Commission's internet web site or in Commission publications; and 4,000 persons to be interviewed by CPSC's Hotline operators.

*Estimated annual average number of hours per respondent:* 20 min. for each

telephone interview; 5.0 hours for each on-site interview; 12 min. to fill out a form; 10 min. for each Hotline interview.

*Estimated total annual number of hours for all respondents:* 3,700.

## 3. Comments on the Commission's Federal Register Notice Announcing its Intention to Request an Extension of the Approval of this Collection of Information

As noted above, the Commission received one comment, from representatives of seven manufacturers of all-terrain vehicles (ATV's), on its previous **Federal Register** notice announcing its intention to request an extension of the approval of this collection of information. A summary of this comment, and the Commission's response, is given below.

*Comment 1.* "The Proposed Extension Notice Indicates CPSC Is Shifting Away From In-Depth Investigations and Increasingly Relying on Unverified Information Submitted By Consumers or Their Legal Representatives."

*Response.* The lower number of IDI's between the submissions to OMB in the year 1997 and the year 2000 does not reflect any basic change in CPSC's investigation philosophy.

In 1997, the clearance request covered 700 on-site and 2200 telephone investigations, so that CPSC would have clearance to follow up on every case CPSC analysts determined required an investigation. However, fewer cases than estimated were actually conducted. The 2000 clearance request (400 on-site and 1600 telephone investigations) is consistent with the actual number of investigations now being conducted annually and with the Commission's current resource allocations.

To broaden the scope of data collection, the Commission continues to use multiple data sources, including some anecdotal sources. Newsclips, consumer complaints, coroner reports, and reports received through our Hotline are examples of such anecdotal data sources used by the Commission. The addition of Internet sites to the data collection sources reflects CPSC's continuing efforts to broaden the scope of data collection efforts by identifying and using additional sources as appropriate.

Anecdotal data may help identify hazard patterns that deserve further attention. However, anecdotal data are not used as the basis for product safety determinations. Those determinations use data provided by in-depth investigations. Often, the extent to which an incident is susceptible to independent verification cannot be

determined until some follow up, covered by this approval request, is conducted.

*Comment 2.* "Information Submitted to CPSC Through the Hotline or Over the Internet Regarding Products Such as ATV's is Unverified, Inherently Suspect and Thus of No Practical Utility for Hazard Identification or Analysis."

*Response.* Although anecdotal data are collected and utilized by the Commission, these data are not treated as a scientific sample and are not used to make safety determinations about ATV's. Except where states forbid contact with next-of-kin or the initiation of investigations when the source of information is a death certificate, all ATV-related death incidents reported to the Commission are substantiated by exhaustive IDI's. Therefore, the number of ATV investigations is directly related to the number of reports received through the various data sources utilized by the Commission. For ATV-related injuries, the Commission relies upon the scientific sample provided by its National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS), a stratified cluster sample of reports of hospital emergency-room-treated product-related injuries.

The increase in the number of callers to the Commission's Hotline reflected in the submission to OMB results, at least in part, from Commission efforts to expand and improve information approaches in order to increase public awareness about its role in product safety. For the year 2000 request, CPSC has used the number of incidents expected to be reported to the Hotline (4000) as the number of persons expected to be interviewed by telephone.

Incident reports received through the Hotline are also an important source of incidents assigned for investigation. The decision whether to investigate a product-related incident can involve a number of factors, including the perceived seriousness of the hazard and the number of similar incidents reported.

The Commission's use of the Internet as a data source is a fairly recent example of efforts to expand data collection efforts. The increase in the number of incident reports gathered from the Internet reflects increased use of the Internet. The Internet is a new source of very important incident data, but very few of these reports pertain to ATV's.

These reports are never used as a substitute for investigations. CPSC has historically investigated every ATV-related death. This practice has not changed.

*Comment 3.* "CPSC Must Be Careful To Avoid Mischaracterization In Its IDIs Regarding ATVs"

*Response.* CPSC investigators are trained to report the sequence of events in ATV incidents, not just the precipitating event. In each of the cases cited by the commenters as examples of mischaracterization, the investigator correctly reported a collision. Any overturn was reported as an action subsequent to the collision. The incidents are reflected in the database accordingly. The CPSC staff is not aware of any investigation being reported solely as an overturn where it is apparent that some other event preceded the overturn.

Further, when these data are coded for entering into the All-Terrain Vehicle Death (ATVD) database, the first event (such as a collision) is coded as the primary hazard pattern, followed by any subsequent events (such as rollover).

Discrepancies are often encountered in various documents gathered during an investigation. Investigators do their best to resolve such discrepancies and correctly note such information in the investigation report.

#### 4. Comments to OMB on This Request for Extension

Comments on this request for extension of approval of collection of information should be submitted by May 31, 2000, to the addresses given at the beginning of this notice.

Copies of the request for extension of the information collection and supporting documentation are available from Linda Glatz, Management and Program Analyst, Office of Planning and Evaluation, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; telephone: (301) 504-0416, ext. 2226, email [lglatz@cpsc.gov](mailto:lglatz@cpsc.gov).

Dated: April 26, 2000.

**Sadye E. Dunn,**

*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 00-10833 Filed 4-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Closed Meeting of the Board of Visitors for the Department of Defense Centers for Regional Security Studies

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice of closed meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Under the provisions of Public Law 92-463, the "Federal Advisory Committee Act," notice of a

meeting of the Board of Visitors for Department of Defense Centers for Regional Security must be published.

The Board will meet in closed session at the Pentagon on April 26 from 0900 to 1330.

The purpose of the meeting is to allow the Board of Visitors to provide advice on the role the Centers for Regional Security play in the broader U.S. national security context. The Board will hold classified discussions on various national security policies to be handled by the regional centers as outlined in the Defense Planning Guidance and related to the Theater Engagement Plans of the Commanders-in-Chief of the Unified Commands. This notice is being published less than fifteen days prior to the meeting because of a scheduling oversight.

In accordance with section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II (1982)), it has been determined that this meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. § 552b (c)(1)(1982), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Berry, (703) 695-6386.

Dated: April 21, 2000.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 00-10749 Filed 4-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-10-V

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000-0114]

#### Proposed Collection; Comment Request Entitled Right of First Refusal of Employment

**AGENCIES:** Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

**ACTION:** Notice of request for public comments regarding an extension to an existing OMB clearance (9000-0114).

**SUMMARY:** Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve an extension of a currently approved

information collection requirement concerning Right of First Refusal of Employment. This OMB clearance currently expires on August 31, 2000.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**DATES:** Comments may be submitted on or before June 30, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments including suggestions for reducing this burden, should be submitted to: FAR Desk Officer, OMB, Room 10102, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, and a copy to the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVRs), Room 4035 1800 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20405.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ralph DeStefano, Office of Federal Acquisition Policy Division, GSA (202) 501-1758.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Purpose

Right of First Refusal of Employment is a regulation which establishes policy regarding adversely affected or separated Government employees resulting from the conversion from in-house performance to performance by contract. The policy will enable these employees to have an opportunity to work for the contractor who is awarded the contract.

The information gathered will be used by the Government to gain knowledge of which employees, adversely affected or separated as a result of the contract award, have gained employment with the contractor within 90 days after contract performance begins.

##### B. Annual Reporting Burden

*Number of Respondents:* 130.

*Responses Per Respondent:* 1.

*Total Responses:* 130.

*Average Burden Hours Per Response:*

3.

*Total Burden Hours:* 390.

##### Obtaining Copies of Proposals

Requester may obtain a copy of the proposal from the General Services