

- 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 submission of responses.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Agency:* Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

*Title:* Hazard Communication—29 CFR 1200; 1915; 1917; 1918; 1926; 1928.  
*OMB Number:* 1218-0072.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit; farms; Federal Government; and State, Local, or Tribal Government.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Number of Respondents:* 6,035,925.

*Type of Response:* Recordkeeping and Third-party disclosure.

Requirement	Annual responses	Average response time (hours)	Estimated annual burden hours
1. Written Hazard Communication Program—New Establishments:			
Manufacturing .....	5,258	5.00	26,290
Non-Manufacturing .....	61,465	2.50	153,663
2. Written Hazard Communication Program—Existing Establishments:			
Manufacturing .....	154,644	1.00	154,644
Non-Manufacturing .....	2,259,726	0.50	1,129,863
3. Hazardous Determination .....	30,248	8	241,984
4. Existing Establishments Sending of MSDSs for New Hazardous:			
Manufacturing .....	1,014,462	0.14	142,025
Non-Manufacturing .....	3,434,784	0.14	480,870
5. New Establishments Sending MSDSs for All Hazardous Chemicals:			
Manufacturing .....	465,648	0.14	65,191
Non-Manufacturing .....	1,261,262	0.14	176,577
6. Obtaining & Maintaining MSDSs—Existing Establishments:			
Manufacturing .....	154,644	1.00	154,644
Non-Manufacturing .....	2,259,726	1.00	2,259,726
7. Obtaining & Maintaining MSDSs—New Establishments:			
Manufacturing .....	465,648	0.14	65,191
Non-Manufacturing .....	1,261,262	0.14	176,577
8. Labeling Shipping Containers .....	0	0.00	0
9. Labeling In-Plant Containers .....	443,636,930	0.0033	1,464,002
10. Access to Trade Secrets .....	62,870	4.00	251,480
Employee Access .....	3,621,555	0.17	603,351
Federal Access .....	92,351	0.08	7,388
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>460,242,484</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>7,553,465</b>

*Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs:* \$0.

*Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services):* \$247,039.

*Description:* 29 CFR 1200; 1915; 1917; 1918; 1926; and 1928 require all employers to establish hazard communication programs and to transmit information on the hazards of chemicals to their employees by means of container labels, material safety data sheets and training programs. These actions reduce the incidents of chemical-related illnesses and injury in the workplace.

**Ira L. Mills,**

*Departmental Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02-11155 Filed 5-3-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-23-M**

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Pre-PIRT Meeting on Triso Coated Fuel Particles**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

*Purpose:* The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will hold a pre-PIRT (Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table) meeting to identify Phenomena and issues related to TRISO coated fuel particles in order to develop research program. PIRTs have been used at NRC since 1988, and they provide a structured way to obtain a technical understanding that is needed to address certain issues.

**DATES:** May 28-29, 2002 (9 a.m.-5 p.m. and 9 a.m.-3:30 p.m. respectively).

**ADDRESSES:** Rooms T-10C2 on May 28, 2002 and T-2C2 on May 29, 2002 of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD.

**Participants**

This is a technical workshop to be conducted as roundtable discussions and presentation of handouts between the NRC staff and NRC and DOE contractors. Agenda will be provided to invited participants before the meeting. All handouts will be published as part of a NUREG/CR report. Invited NRC and DOE contractors are as follows:

- Brent Boyack, Los Alamos National Laboratory
- Syd Ball, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
- Robert Morris, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
- David Petti, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
- Dana Powers, Sandia National Laboratory
- Randy Gaunt, Sandia National Laboratory
- NRC Staff

**Public Attendance**

The meeting will be conducted as roundtable discussions between the invited participants and NRC staff.

Although the focus of discussions will be among invited participants and NRC staff, the meeting is open to public. Members of the audience will be given opportunity to comment before the lunch breaks and at the end of the meetings each day. They may also submit written comments after the meeting. All written comments should be received within 15 days of conclusion of the meeting. All written comments which are received within 15 days of the conclusion of the meeting will be published as part of the NUREG/CR report.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting agenda will be posted on the NRC Web site at [www.nrc.gov/RES/meetings.html](http://www.nrc.gov/RES/meetings.html) by May 20, 2002. Attendees will need to obtain a visitor badge at the TWFN building lobby and an escort is required.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Frank Odar, SMSAB, Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone (301) 415-6500.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of April 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Farouk Eltawila,**

*Director, Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 02-11137 Filed 5-3-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Competition in Contracting; Contract Bundling

**AGENCY:** Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is reviewing federal agencies' use of competition in their contracting activities. Although "full and open" competition remains the general rule when agencies acquire goods and services, a variety of legislative, regulatory, and policy initiatives, implemented primarily over the past decade, authorize competition on a significantly more restricted and informal basis. The purpose of this review, which has been called for by the White House, is to identify steps for ensuring that agency competition practices facilitate access to the full range of marketplace capabilities—especially those of small businesses—to

consistently achieve good quality at lower cost to the taxpayer. This review will occur in conjunction with an initiative to address contract bundling (i.e., the consolidation of two or more requirements previously provided or performed under separate smaller contracts into a single contract that is likely to be unsuitable for award to a small business).

OMB invites interested parties from both the public and private sector, and especially from small businesses, to provide comments on: The positive and negative effects of agency competition practices from the 1990s to the present, and the impact of contract bundling. Interested parties may offer oral and/or written comments at a public meeting to be held on June 14, 2002. Parties may also provide written comments directly to OMB's Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) by the date indicated below.

**DATES: Public Meeting:** A public meeting will be conducted at the address shown below on June 14, 2002, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. Eastern standard time. The time period may be extended based on the level of interest expressed. Parties wishing to make formal oral presentations at the public meeting must contact Ms. Barbara Diering of OFPP by June 3, 2002. Due to time limitations, OFPP will notify individuals of their speaking status (time) prior to the meeting. Time allocations for oral presentations will depend on the number of individuals who desire to make presentations. Parties wishing to share written statements at the public meeting must submit such statements to OFPP by June 7, 2002.

**Statements:** In lieu of, or in addition to, participating in the public meeting, interested parties may submit comments to OFPP at the address shown below on or before July 1, 2002.

**ADDRESSES: Public Meeting:** The public meeting will be held at the General Services Administration (GSA) auditorium, 18th and F Streets NW., Washington, DC 20405.

**Statements:** Interested parties may send comments by electronic mail (e-mail) to [bdiering@omb.eop.gov](mailto:bdiering@omb.eop.gov). While e-mail is preferred, parties may alternatively submit comments by facsimile (202) 395-5105. In either case, please cite "Competition in contracting review" as the subject. Since hard copy mail is not being accepted on a regular basis (due to security reasons), comments should not be submitted in this mode. Parties that cannot submit comments using either e-mail or facsimile should contact Ms. Diering.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For clarification of subject matter related to the review of competition practices: Mr. Mathew Blum, OFPP, (202) 395-4953.

For clarification of subject matter related to contract bundling and small business issues: Mr. Michael Gerich, OFPP, (202) 395-6811.

For public meeting information and submission of comments to OFPP: Ms. Barbara Diering, OFPP, (202) 395-3256.

The TTY number for further information is: 1-800-877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 1984, the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA), Public Law 98-369, sec. 2701, established "full and open" as the competition standard in federal contracting. CICA's enactment marked a culmination of concerns that competition had become the exception, rather than the rule, in acquiring goods and services. Despite these concerns, CICA's approach to competition has been criticized as unduly burdensome and complex. These concerns led to a series of legislative, regulatory, and policy reforms—the most significant of which occurred in the mid-1990s—to streamline and simplify competition and contracting processes. Many of these changes authorize competition on a relatively restrictive and informal basis. These changes include, among others:

- Authority to conduct limited competitions under multiple award task and delivery order contracts (MACs) or GSA's Multiple Award Schedules (MAS) program, where the source selection process for becoming a contract holder is open to all interested sources but competitions for orders are limited to pre-qualified contract holders; and

- Authority to seek competition "to the maximum extent practicable" using simplified source selection procedures for all actions under the simplified acquisition threshold (SAT), which is currently at \$100,000, and, on a test basis, up to \$5 million for commercial items.

An increasing number of recent reports addressing streamlined acquisition processes and competition practices, including studies by the General Accounting Office and agency inspectors general, call into question whether agencies are taking advantage of the full range of marketplace capabilities in their use of competition. In addition, concerns have been voiced that other acquisition practices are also limiting opportunities for contractors, especially small businesses. In particular, there is ongoing concern that agencies are unnecessarily bundling