

When ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the seven separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, DC this 2nd day of December 1999.

Carl J. Poleskey,

Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 99-31641 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-27-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Qualification and Certification Program

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

DATES: Submit comments on or before February 8, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Dianne B. Hill, Program Analysis Officer, Office of Program Evaluation and Information Resources, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Room 715, Arlington, VA 22203-1984.

Commenters are encouraged to send their comments on a computer disk, or via Internet E-mail to dhill@msha.gov, along with an original printed copy. Ms. Hill can be reached at (703) 235-1470 (voice) or (703) 235-1563 (facsimile).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane B. Hill, Program Analysis Officer, Office of Program Evaluation and Information Resources, U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Room 719, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203-1984. Ms. Hill can be reached at dhill@msha.gov (Internet E-mail), (703) 235-1470 (voice), or (703) 235-1563 (facsimile).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Persons performing tasks and certain required examinations at coal mines which are related to miner safety and health, and which require specialized experience, are required to be either "certified" or "qualified". The regulations recognize State certification and qualification programs. However, where state programs are not available, under the Mine Act and MSHA standards, the Secretary may certify and qualify persons for as long as they continue to satisfy the requirements needed to obtain the certification or qualification, fulfill any applicable retraining requirements, and remain employed at the same mine or by the same independent contractor.

Applications for Secretarial certification must be submitted to the MSHA Qualification and Certification Unit in Denver, Colorado. MSHA Forms 5000-4 and 5000-7 provide the coal mining industry with a standardized reporting format which expedites the certification process while ensuring compliance with the regulations. The information provided on the forms enables the Secretary of Labor's delegate—MSHA, Qualification and Certification Unit—to determine if the applicants satisfy the requirements to obtain the certification or qualification. Persons must meet certain minimum experience requirements depending on the type of certification or qualification applied for.

II. Desired Focus on Comments

Currently, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to the Qualification and Certification Program. MSHA is particularly interested in comments which:

- * Evaluate 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;

- * Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

- * Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- * 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, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the employee listed above in the For Further Information Contact section of this notice.

III. Current Actions

This request for collection of information contains provisions whereby persons may be temporarily qualified or certified to perform tests and examinations; requiring specialized expertise; related to miner safety and health at coal mines.

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Qualification and Certification Program.

Agency Number: MSHA Forms 5000-4 and 5000-7.

OMB Number: 1219-0069.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response (hours)	Burden hours*
75.100(c)(1) and 77.100(b)(2)	578	On occasion	2,428	0.0833	202
75.155(a)(2) and 77.105(a)(2)	33	On occasion	133	0.0833	11
Total	611	2,561	0.0831	213

* Discrepancies due to rounding.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): \$0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): \$202.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 3, 1999.

George M. Fesak,

Director, Program Evaluation and Information Resources.

[FR Doc. 99-32056 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-440]

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company; Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58, issued to the FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee), for operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, located in Lake County, Ohio.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would eliminate the requirement in the Environmental Protection Plan to perform semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of Lake Erie sediment in the Perry and Eastlake Plant area for Corbicula (i.e., Asiatic clams).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated September 9, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The Perry Environmental Protection Plan was modified in 1988 to require semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of areas at Perry and the licensee's Eastlake Plant to detect the presence of Corbicula. The purpose of the monitoring program is to provide for sufficient time to prepare for prevention and control programs, should Corbicula be detected at the Perry site. Corbicula, which have been detected in Lake Erie at the Eastlake Plant since June 1987, have not been detected at the Perry site. Zebra Mussels have been detected at the Perry site since 1987 and an effective control program has been implemented to suppress their growth and minimize the potential for system biofouling. The

licensee has concluded that the control program used for Zebra Mussels at the Perry site would be equally effective against Corbicula. Therefore, since adequate control programs have already been implemented at the Perry site, there would be no apparent benefit in requiring the licensee to perform semi-annual sampling for their detection. The proposed action is needed to eliminate the sampling program in the Environmental Protection Plan. The elimination of the sampling program will result in savings of about \$22,000 per year.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is acceptable because the control program currently implemented to monitor and mitigate potential biofouling by Zebra Mussels would be equally effective for Corbicula.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any 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 nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

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

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 27, 1999, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, Carol O'Claire, of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated September 9, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Douglas V. Pickett,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-32058 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a revision to a 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.

Revision 3 of Regulatory Guide 1.105, "Setpoints for Safety-Related Instrumentation," describes a method acceptable to the NRC staff for complying with the NRC's regulations for ensuring that setpoints for safety-related instrumentation are initially within and remain within the technical