the 4,4'-Methylenedianiline Standard 29 CFR 1910.1050

A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the employee listed below in the addressee section of this notice. The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information 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.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted by March 31, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments are to be submitted to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR 98–4, U.S. Department of labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, telephone number (202) 219–7894. Written comments limited to 10 pages or less in length may also be transmitted by facsimile to (202) 219–5046.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adrian Corsey, Directorate of Health Standards Programs, Occupation Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N3718, telephone (202) 219–7075. Copies of the referenced information collection request are available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office and will be mailed immediately to persons who request copies by telephoning Adrian Corsey at (202) 219–7075 extension 105 or Barbara Bielaski at (202) 219–8076 extension 142. For electronic copies of the Information Collection Request on 4,4′-Methylenedianiline, contact OSHA's WebPage on the Internet at http://www.osha.gov/ and click on standards.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The 4,4′-Methylenedianiline standard and its information collection requirements is to provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with occupation exposure to 4,4′-Methylenedianiline. The standard requires that employers establish a compliance program, including exposure monitoring and medical surveillance records These records are used by employees, physicians, employers and OSHA to determine the effectiveness of the employers' compliance efforts. Also the standard requires that OSHA have access to various records to ensure that employers are complying with the disclosure provisions of the 4,4′Methylenedianiline Standard.

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Title: 4,4′-Methylenedianiline 29 CFR 1910.1050.

OMB Number: 1218–0184.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit, Federal government, State and Local governments.

Total Respondents: 18.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Responses: 1175.

Average Time per Response: Ranges from 5 minutes to maintain records to 2 hours to monitor employee exposure.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 710.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total initial annual costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): $26,616.

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

Dated: January 22, 1998.

Adam Finkel,

Director, Directorate of Health Standards Programs.

[FR Doc. 98–2355 Filed 1–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection: Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collection under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: NRC Form 212, Qualifications Investigation, and NRC Form 212A, Qualifications Investigation Secretarial/Clerical.

2. Current OMB approval number: 3150–0033 for NRC 212, 3150–0034 for NRC 212A.

3. How often the collection is required: Whenever Human Resources' specialists determine qualification investigations are required in conjunction with applications for employment related to vacancies.

4. Who is required or asked to report: Supervisors, former supervisors, and/or other references of external applicants.

5. The number of annual respondents: NRC Form 212, 1400 annually, NRC Form 212A, 300 annually.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: NRC Form 212, 350 hours (15 minutes per response), NRC Form 212A, 75 hours (15 minutes per response).

7. Abstract: Information requested on NRC Forms 212 and 212A is used to determine the qualifications and suitability of external applicants for employment in professional and clerical or secretarial positions with the NRC. The completed form may be used to examine, rate and/or assess the prospective employee's qualifications. The information regarding the qualifications of applicants for employment is reviewed by professional personnel of the Office of Human Resources, in conjunction with other information in the NRC files, to determine the qualifications of the applicant for appointment to the position under consideration.

Submit, by March 31, 1998, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?
2. Is the burden estimate accurate?
3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?
4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov) under the FedWorld collection link on the home page tool

bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC 20555–0001, or by telephone at (301) 415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–2323 Filed 1–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–282]

Northern States Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–42; Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–42 issued to Northern States Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendment would initiate a one-time only change for Prairie Island Unit 1 Cycle 19 that would allow the use of the moveable incore detector system for measurement of the core peaking factors with less than 75% and greater than or equal to 50% of the detector thimbles available.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve an increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. The moveable incore detector system is used only to provide confirmatory information on the neutron flux distribution and is not required for the daily safe operation of the core. The system is not a process variable that is an initial condition in the accident analyses. The only accident that the moveable incore detector system could be involved in is the breaching of the detector thimbles which would be enveloped by the small break loss of coolant accident (LOCA) analysis. As the proposed changes do not involve any changes to the system's equipment and no equipment is operated in a new or more harmful manner, there is no increase in the probability of such an accident.

The proposed [amendment] would not involve an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The moveable incore detector system provides a monitoring function that is not used for accident mitigation (the system is not used in the primary success path for mitigation of a design basis accident). The ability of the reactor protection system or engineered safety features system instrumentation to mitigate the consequences of an accident will not be impaired by the proposed changes. The small break LOCA analysis (and thus its consequences) continues to bound potential breaching of the system's detector thimbles.

With greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the detector thimbles available, core peaking factor measurement uncertainties will be increased, which could impact the core peaking factors and as a result could affect the consequences of certain accidents. However, any changes in the core peaking factors resulting from increased measurement uncertainties will be compensated for by conservative measurement uncertainty adjustments in the Technical Specifications to ensure that pertinent core design parameters are maintained. Sufficient additional penalty is added to the power distribution measurements such that this change will not impact the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed [amendment] would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated as [it] only affect[s] the minimum complement of equipment necessary for operability of the moveable incore detector system. There is no change in plant configuration, equipment or equipment design. No equipment is operated in a new manner. Thus the changes will not create any new or different accident causal mechanisms. The accident analysis in the Updated Safety Analysis Report remains bounding.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The reduction in the minimum complement of equipment necessary for the operability of the moveable incore detector system could only impact the monitoring/calibration functions of the system. Reduction of the number of available moveable incore detector thimbles to the 50% level does not significantly degrade the ability of the system to measure core power distributions. With greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the detector thimbles available, core peaking factor measurement uncertainties will be increased, but will be compensated for by conservative measurement uncertainty adjustments in the Technical Specifications to ensure that pertinent core design parameters are maintained. Sufficient additional penalty is added to the power distribution measurements such that this change does not impact the safety margins which currently exist. Also, the reduction of available detector thimbles has negligible impact on the quadrant power tilt and core average axial power shape measurements. Sufficient detector thimbles will be available to ensure that no quadrant will be unmonitored.

Based on these factors, the proposed changes in this license amendment will not result in a significant reduction in the plant's margin of safety, as the core will continue to be adequately monitored.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would