

## II. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (*i.e.* employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA-95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and cost) is minimal, collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information collection burden is correct. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657).

The standards on Construction Fall Protection Systems Criteria and Practice (29 CFR 1926.502) and Training Requirements (29 CFR 1926.503) ensure that employers provide the required fall protection for their employees. Accordingly, these standards have the following paperwork requirements: Paragraphs (c)(4)(ii) and (k) of 29 CFR 1926.502, which specify certification of safety nets and development of fall-protection plans, respectively, and paragraph (b) of 29 CFR 1926.502, which requires employers to certify training records. The training-certification requirement specified in paragraph (b) of 29 CFR 1926.503 documents the training provided to employees potentially exposed to fall hazards. A competent person must train these employees to recognize fall hazards and in the use of procedures and equipment that minimize these hazards. An employer must verify compliance with this training requirement by preparing and maintaining a written certification record that contains the: Name or other identifier of the employee receiving the training; the date(s) of the training; and the signature of the competent person who conducted the training or of the employer.

## III. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions to protect workers,

including whether the information is useful;

- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

## IV. Proposed Actions

OSHA is proposing to extend the information collection requirements in the Construction Fall Protection Plans and Records (29 CFR 1926.502 and 1926.503). The Agency is proposing to increase the burden by 149,895 hours, from 771,166 hours to 921,061 hours, mainly as a result of increasing the estimated number of fall protection plans. The fall protection plan and certification records of net drop test and training are needed to help employees identify fall hazards and to know which protective measures are to be used.

OSHA will summarize the comments submitted in response to this notice, and will include this summary in the request to OMB to extend the approval of the information collection requirements contained in the Construction Fall Protection Plans and Records Standard.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently-approved information collection requirement.

*Title:* Construction Fall Protection Plans and Training Requirements in Construction (29 CFR 1926.502 and 1926.503).

*OMB Number:* 1218-0197.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit.

*Number of Respondents:* 100,080.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Average Time Per Response:* Varies (*i.e.*, 5 minutes (.08 hour) to certify a safety net to 65 minutes to develop and write a fall-protection plan).

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 921,061.

*Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance):* 0.

## V. Authority and Signature

John L. Henshaw, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506), and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5-2002 (67 FR 65008).

Signed at Washington, DC on December 17, 2003.

**John L. Henshaw,**

*Assistant Secretary of Labor.*

[FR Doc. 03-31550 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-26-M**

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

### Study of IMLS Funded Digital Collections and Content—Focus Groups, Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Institute of Museum and Library Services, NFAH.

**ACTION:** Notice of requests for new information collection approval.

**SUMMARY:** The Institute of Museum and Library Services announces the following information collection has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this proposed information collection request, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Director of Research and Technology, Rebecca Danvers at (202) 606-2478. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY/TDD) may call (202) 606-8636.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by January 22, 2004. The OMB 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 submission of responses.

**ADDRESSES:** For a copy of the information collection request contact: Rebecca Danvers, Director of Research

and Technology, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Room 223, Washington, DC 20506.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

The Institute of Museum and Library Services is an independent Federal grant-making agency authorized by the Museum and Library Services Act, Public Law 104-208. The IMLS provides a variety of grant programs to assist the nation's museums and libraries in improving their operations and enhancing their services to the public. Museums and libraries of all sizes and types may receive support from IMLS programs. In the National Leadership Grant Program, IMLS funds the digitization of library and museum collections.

This study is to determine the feasibility of using the Open Archives Initiative (OAI) Metadata Harvesting Protocol to aggregate and provide integrated item-level search access to the digitization projects funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the National Leadership Grant Program.

**II. Current Action**

To develop an effective Open Archives Initiative metadata harvesting protocol information will be collected from focus groups of resource developers.

*Agency:* Institute of Museum and Library Services

*Title:* Study of IMLS Funded Digital Collections and Content

*OMB Number:* none.

*Agency Number:* 3137.

*Frequency:* Once.

*Affected Public:* Museums and libraries that created digital collections with IMLS funding.

*Number of Respondents:* 20, in two focus groups.

*Estimated Time Per Respondent:* 1.5 hours.

*Total Burden Hours:* 30.

*Total Annualized capital/startup costs:* n/a.

*Total Costs:* \$1,125.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Comments should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn.: OMB Desk Officer for Education, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202) 395-7316.

Dated: December 17, 2003.

**Rebecca Danvers,**

*Director, Research and Technology.*

[FR Doc. 03-31518 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7036-01-M**

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-305]

**Nuclear Management Company, LLC, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant; 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. DPR-43, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, located in Kewaunee County, Wisconsin. Therefore, 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 revise the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant operating license and technical specifications (TSs) to increase the licensed rated power by 6.0 percent from 1673 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 1772 MWt.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 22, 2003.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action permits an increase in the licensed core thermal power from 1673 MWt to 1772 MWt for the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, providing the flexibility to obtain a higher electrical output from the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant with minimal modifications.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The licensee has submitted an environmental evaluation supporting the proposed stretch power uprate and provided a summary of its conclusions concerning the radiological and non-radiological environmental impacts of the proposed action.

**Radiological Environmental Assessment**

The stretch power uprate will increase the activity level of radioactive isotopes in the primary and secondary coolant. Due to leakage or process operations, fractions of these fluids are transported to the liquid and gaseous radwaste systems where they are processed prior to discharge. As the activity levels in the primary and secondary coolant are increased, the activity level of radwaste inputs is

proportionately increased. Regulatory guidance relative to methodology to be utilized to establish whether the radwaste effluent releases from a pressurized-water reactor meet the requirements of 10 CFR part 20 and 10 CFR part 50, appendix I, is provided in NUREG-0017, Revision 1. The NUREG-0017 methodology is independent of the length of the fuel cycle.

The maximum expected increase in the reactor coolant source (associated with the chemical group with the largest percentage increase) is approximately 17.6 percent for noble gas activity. This increase is primarily a combination of the impact of core power uprate and reduction in reactor coolant system (RCS) mass. Considering the accuracy and error bounds of the operational data utilized in NUREG-0017, this percentage change is well within the uncertainty of the existing NUREG-0017-based expected reactor coolant isotopic inventory used for radwaste effluent analyses and corrected for a facility with this power rating.

As discussed above, there is approximately a 17.6 percent increase assumed for the liquid releases as input activities are based on the largest long-term RCS activity increase for any chemical grouping and on waste volumes which are essentially independent of power level within the applicability range of NUREG-0017. Tritium releases in liquid effluents are assumed to increase approximately 11.4 percent (corresponding to the effective increase in core power) since the facility is changing its power rating, without changing its operational procedures. However, for all liquid releases, the power uprate analysis conservatively used the worst case scaling factor for all isotopes between the pre-uprate case and the uprate case.

For all noble gases (limiting chemical group), there will be a maximum 17.6 percent increase in effluent releases due to the core power uprate. Gaseous releases of Kr-85 in actuality will increase by approximately 11.4 percent. Isotopes with shorter half lives will have increases slightly greater than the percentage increase in power level. The decrease in RCS mass (approximately 5 percent) contributes to the increased concentration of this chemical group in the RCS (the primary removal term for the non-Kr-85 noble gases is decay in the RCS) such that the impact of power uprate is conservatively approximated at 17.6 percent. The impact of the power uprate in iodine releases is approximated by the power level increase. The other components of the gaseous release (that is, particulates via the building ventilation systems and