regular inspections of the EPBMTBM’s hyperbaric equipment and support systems (such as temperature control, illumination, ventilation, and fire-prevention and fire-suppression systems), and hyperbaric work areas, as required under 29 CFR 1926.20(b)(2), including:

(a) Developing a set of checklists to be used by a competent person in conducting weekly inspections of hyperbaric equipment and work areas; and
(b) Ensuring that a competent person conducts daily visual checks and weekly inspections of the EPBMTBM.

2. Remove from service any equipment that constitutes a safety hazard until it corrects the hazardous condition and has the correction approved by a qualified person.

3. Ballard would have to maintain records of all tests and inspections of the EPBMTBM, as well as associated corrective actions and repairs, at the job site for the duration of the job.

Compression and Decompression

Ballard would have to consult with its attending physician concerning the need for special compression or decompression exposures appropriate for CAWs not acclimated to hyperbaric exposure.

Recordkeeping

In addition to completing OSHA’s Form 301 Injury and Illness Incident Report and OSHA’s Form 300 Log of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses, Ballard would have to maintain records of:

1. The date, times (e.g., time compression started, time spent decompressing, time performing intervention, time spent decompressing), and pressure for each hyperbaric intervention.
2. The names of all supervisors and DMTs involved for each intervention.
3. The name of each individual worker exposed to hyperbaric pressure and the decompression protocols and results for each worker.
4. The total number of interventions and the amount of hyperbaric work time at each pressure.
5. The results of the post-intervention physical assessment of each CAW for signs and symptoms of decompression illness, barotrauma, nitrogen narcosis, oxygen toxicity, or other health effects associated with work in compressed air for each hyperbaric intervention.

Notifications

1. To assist OSHA in administering the conditions specified herein, Ballard would have to:

(a) Notify the OTPCA and the LIAO of any recordable injury, illness, in-patient hospitalization, amputation, loss of an eye, or fatality that occurs as a result of hyperbaric exposures during EPBMTBM operations, including those that do not require recompression treatment (e.g., nitrogen narcosis, oxygen toxicity, barotrauma), but still meet the recordable injury or illness criteria of 29 CFR 1904. The notification would have to be made within 8 hours of the incident or 8 hours after becoming aware of a recordable injury, illness, or fatality; a copy of the incident investigation (OSHA’s Form 301 Injury and Illness Incident Report) must be submitted to OSHA within 24 hours of the incident or 24 hours after becoming aware of a recordable injury, illness, or fatality. In addition to the information required by OSHA’s Form 301 Injury and Illness Incident Report, the incident-investigation report would have to include a root-cause determination, and the preventive and corrective actions identified and implemented.

(b) Provide certification to the LIAO within 15 working days of the incident that Ballard informed affected workers of the incident and the results of the incident investigation (including the root-cause determination as well as the preventive and corrective actions identified and implemented).

(c) Notify the OTPCA and the LIAO within 15 working days and in writing, of any change in the compressed-air operations that affects Ballard’s ability to comply with the proposed conditions specified herein.

(d) Upon completion of the Suffolk County Outoff Tunnel, evaluate the effectiveness of the decompression tables used throughout the project, and provide a written report of this evaluation to the OTPCA and the LIAO.

Note: The evaluation report would have to contain summaries of (1) the number, dates, durations, and pressures of the hyperbaric interventions completed; (2) decompression protocols implemented (including composition of gas mixtures, air, and/or oxygen), and the results achieved; (3) the total number of interventions and the number of hyperbaric incidents (decompression illnesses and/or health effects associated with hyperbaric interventions as recorded on OSHA’s Form 301 Injury and Illness Incident Report and OSHA’s Form 300 Log of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses, and relevant medical diagnoses, and treating physicians’ opinions); and (4) root causes of any hyperbaric incidents, and preventive and corrective actions identified and implemented.

(e) To assist OSHA in administering the proposed conditions specified herein, inform the OTPCA and the LIAO as soon as possible, but no later than seven (7) days, after it has knowledge that it will:

(i) Cease doing business;
(ii) Change the location and address of the main office for managing the tunneling operations specified herein; or
(iii) Transfer the operations specified herein to a successor company.

Report and OSHA’s Form 300 Log of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses and/or health effects associated with work in compressed air for each hyperbaric intervention.

2. OSHA would have to approve the transfer of the proposed Permanent Variance to a successor company.

VII. Authority and Signature

Loren Sweat, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210, authorized the preparation of this notice. Accordingly, the agency is issuing this notice pursuant to Section 29 U.S.C. 655(b)(d), Secretary of Labor’s Order No. 8—2020 (85 FR 58393; Sept. 18, 2020), and 29 CFR 1905.11.

Signed at Washington, DC, on January 13, 2021.

Loren Sweat,
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

BILGING CODE 4510-26-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Recommendations From the Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee to the Office of Management and Budget Concerning Changes to the 2010 Standards for Delineating Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requests public comment on the recommendations it has received from the Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee for changes to OMB’s metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area standards. These standards determine the procedures for delineating and updating the statistical areas as new data become available, and responses to this request will be
carefully considered by OMB in establishing revised standards.

DATES: Comments must be submitted in writing. To ensure consideration of comments, they must be received no later than 60 days from the publication of this notice. Because of delays in the receipt of regular mail related to security screening, respondents are encouraged to send comments electronically (see ADDRESSES, below).

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent electronically via www.regulations.gov—a Federal E-Government website that allows the public to find, review, and submit comments on documents that agencies have published in the Federal Register and that are open for comment. Simply type “OMB–2021–0001” (including quotation marks) in the Comment or Submission search box, click “Go,” and follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments received by the date specified above will be included as part of the official record.

Comments submitted in response to this notice may be made available to the public. For this reason, please do not include in your comments information of a confidential nature, such as sensitive personal or proprietary information. If you send an email comment, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket. Please note that responses to this public comment request containing any routine notice about the confidentiality of the communication will be treated as public comments that may be made available to the public notwithstanding the inclusion of the routine notice.

Electronic Availability: This notice is available on the internet on the OMB website at https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/. Federal Register notices are also available electronically at https://www.federalregister.gov/.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James D. Fitzsimmons, Chair, Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee, telephone (301) 763–1465; or Email statistical_directives@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Outline of Notice
1. Background
2. Review Process
3. Overview of Recommendations From the Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee
4. Issues for Comment

1. Background

The metropolitan area program has provided standard statistical area delineations for approximately 70 years. In the 1940s, it became clear that the value of statistics produced by Federal agencies would be greatly enhanced if agencies used a single set of geographic delineations for the Nation’s largest centers of population and activity. OMB’s predecessor, the Bureau of the Budget, led the effort to develop what were then called “standard metropolitan areas” in time for their use in 1950 census publications. Since then, comparable data products for metropolitan areas have been available.

The general concept of a metropolitan statistical area is that of an area containing a large population nucleus and adjacent communities that have a high degree of integration with that nucleus. The concept of a micropolitan statistical area closely parallels that of the metropolitan statistical area, but a micropolitan statistical area features a smaller nucleus.

As currently operationalized, a metropolitan statistical area must contain a Census Bureau-delineated urban area with a population of 50,000 or more, while a micropolitan statistical area must contain a Census Bureau-delineated urban area with a population of 10,000 to 49,999. (Areas delineated in annual updates based on Census Bureau place population estimates are excepted from this requirement until the following decade.)

Both metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas are composed of entire counties (Figure 1). “Central counties” are those that have substantial population residing in the largest urban area of the metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area. “Outlying counties” qualify based on having sufficient commuting with the central county or counties of the area. Counties that do not fall within metropolitan or micropolitan statistical areas are termed “outside core based statistical area.”
The purpose of these statistical areas is unchanged from when standard metropolitan areas were first delineated. The classification provides a nationally consistent set of delineations for collecting, tabulating, and publishing Federal statistics for geographic areas. OMB establishes and maintains these areas solely for statistical purposes. In reviewing and revising these areas, OMB does not take into account or attempt to anticipate any public or private sector nonstatistical uses that may be made of the delineations. These areas are not designed to serve as a general-purpose geographic framework applicable for nonstatistical activities or for use in program funding formulas.

2. Review Process

Periodic review of the standards is necessary to ensure their continued usefulness and relevance. OMB reviews the statistical area standards and, if warranted, revises them prior to their application to new decennial census data. The current review of the metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area standards is the seventh such review. In 2018, OMB charged the Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee with examining the 2010 metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area standards and providing recommendations on the standards scheduled to be issued no later than December 2020. Agencies represented on the review committee include the U.S. Census Bureau (Chair), Bureau of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Economic Research Service, National Center for Health Statistics, Statistics of Income, and ex officio, OMB. The Census Bureau provided research support to the committee.

This notice is the first of two anticipated notices related to the review of the 2010 standards. After OMB considers the recommendations of the review committee and the comments received through this notice, any revisions to the standards will be announced in a final notice.

3. Overview of Recommendations From the Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Area Standards Review Committee

The committee noted that the 2010 standards have served the Federal statistical community well over the past decade. There are aspects of the standards, however, that require evaluation in light of experiences from the implementation of the 2010 standards and continuing change in U.S. population and activity patterns.

The committee made the following recommendations in their report to OMB, available as a supplemental document to this Notice at www.regulations.gov:

(1) The minimum urban area population to qualify a metropolitan statistical area should be increased from 50,000 to 100,000 (see Appendix, Part A: Table 1 for a list of current metropolitan statistical areas likely to be among those that would be affected by this recommendation).

(2) The delineation of New England city and town areas (NECTAs), NECTA
division, and combined NECTAs should be discontinued.

(3) Research should be undertaken on an additional, territorially exhaustive classification that covers all of the United States and Puerto Rico.

(4) The first annual delineation update of the coming decade should be combined with the decennial-based delineations.

(5) OMB should make publicly available a schedule for updates to the core based statistical areas (see proposed update schedule below).

(6) OMB should continue use of American Community Survey commuting data in measurement of intercounty connectivity, though changing societal and economic trends may warrant considering changes in the 2030 standards.

Under the recommendations of the committee, OMB would release three different types of updates, subject to the proposed standards.

(1) Annual Updates—These updates would address qualification of new metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas and typically would affect a small number of counties. (In some years, there may be no updates warranted by the data.)

(2) Five-Year (“mid-decade”) Update—This broader update would include: qualification of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas, qualification of outlying counties, merging of adjacent metropolitan or micropolitan statistical areas, qualification of principal cities, categorization of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas, qualification of metropolitan divisions, qualification of combined statistical areas, and titling of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas, metropolitan divisions, and combined statistical areas.

(3) Decennial Delineation—The initial re-delineation following adoption of revised standards would include all of the changes listed for the five-year update, plus the qualification of central counties.

The schedule for these updates as described in the attached proposed standards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Update type</th>
<th>Release date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decennial Delineation</td>
<td>June 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Update</td>
<td>December 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>December 2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Issues for Comment

OMB is seeking comments on the specific recommendations of the committee for revising the 2010 standards and their potential effects on the statistical area delineations (see Section 3 above). Comments are also sought on any other aspect of the current 2010 Standards that are of interest to reviewers, including topics such as commuting thresholds, alternative sources of data, stakeholder engagement, and procedures for OMB dissemination of updates to the delineations, as well as editorial suggestions to help improve the clarity of the standards.

Dominic J. Mancini, Deputy Administrator.
FR Doc. 2021–00988 Filed 1–15–21; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 3110–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2020–0153]

Updated Aging Management Criteria for Reactor Vessel Internal Components for Pressurized-Water Reactors

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Interim staff guidance; issuance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) SLR-ISG–2021–01–PWRVI, “Updated Aging Management Criteria for Reactor Vessel Internal Components for Pressurized-Water Reactors.” This ISG updates the aging management criteria for pressurized-water reactor (PWR) vessel internals components in the NRC’s subsequent license renewal (SLR) guidance documents. Specifically, the ISG revises guidance contained in NUREG–2191, “Generic Aging Lessons Learned for Subsequent License Renewal (GALL–SLR) Report,” and NUREG–2192, “Standard Review Plan for Review of Subsequent License Renewal Applications for Nuclear Power Plants.” This ISG is intended to facilitate preparation of SLR applications by clarifying existing guidance for aging management and adding new guidance, which also will facilitate the NRC staff’s review of SLR applications.

DATES: This guidance is effective on February 18, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2020–0153 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

• Federal Rulemaking Website: Go to https://www.regulations.gov and search for Docket ID NRC–2020–0153. Address questions about Docket IDs in Regulations.gov to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301–287–9127; email: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

• NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. To begin the search, select “Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. For the convenience of the reader, instructions about obtaining materials referenced in this document are provided in the “Availability of Documents” section.

• Attention: The PDR, where you may examine and order copies of public documents, is currently closed. You may submit your request to the PDR via email at pdr.resource@nrc.gov or call 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (EST), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On August 3, 2020 (85 FR 46725), the staff requested public comments on draft SLR-ISG–PWRVI–2020–XX, “Updated Aging Management Criteria for Reactor Vessel Internal Components for Pressurized-Water Reactors.” The NRC received comments from the Electric Power Research Institute, Materials Reliability Program (EPRI MRP) by letter dated September 1, 2020 (ADAMS Accession No. ML20245E539), and from the Nuclear Energy Institute by letter dated September 2, 2020 (ADAMS Accession No. ML20246G854). No other comments were submitted. The NRC staff considered those comments in developing the final version of the ISG. The staff’s responses to the comments are provided in