OMB approval of, the collection-of-information (paperwork) requirements contained in the Cotton Dust Standard (29 CFR 1910.1043). The Agency is reducing its previous burden hour estimate of 138,184 hours by 57,974 mainly due to a reduction of its earlier estimate of the number of employees potentially exposed to cotton dust. 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 Cotton Dust Standard (29 CFR 1910.1043).

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved information-collection requirements.

Title: Cotton Dust Standard.

OMB Number: 1218–0101.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; Federal government; state, local or tribal government

Number of Respondents: 547.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Responses: 280,655.

Average Time per Response: Varies from 5 minutes to provide information to the examining physician to 2 hours to conduct exposure monitoring.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 80,210.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): $5,777,108.

III. Authority and Signature

Charles N. Jeffress, 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 6–96 (62 FR 111).

Signed at Washington, D.C., on February 24, 2000.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 00–4867 Filed 2–29–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. ICR–1218–0101(2000)]

1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP); Extension of the Office of Management of Budget's (OMB Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); Labor.

ACTION: Notice of an opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: OSHA solicits comments concerning the extension of the information collection requirements contained in the DBCP Standard 929 CFR 1910.1044).

Request For Comment

The Agency is particularly interested in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of the Agency'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.

DATE: Submit written comments on or before May 1, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–1218–0101(2000), Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2350. Comments may transmit written comments of 10 pages or less in length by facsimile to (202) 693–1648.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd R. Owen, Directorate of Policy, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3641, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2444. A copy of the Agency's Information Collection Request (ICR) supporting the need for the information collection requirements in the DBCP Standard is available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office, or you may request a mailed copy by telephoning Todd R. Owen at (202) 693–2444. For electronic copies of the ICR on the DBCP Standard, contact OSHA on the Internet at *http:/ www.osha.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

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 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 costs) is minimal, collection instruments clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information burden is correct. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of the 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 information collection requirements in the DBCP Standard provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with exposure to DBCP. In this regard, the DBCP Standard requires employers to monitor employees' exposure to DBCP, monitor employee health, and provide employees with information about their exposures and the health effects of exposure to DBCP.

II. Proposed Actions

OSHA proposes to extend the OMB approval of the collection of information (paperwork) contained in the DBCP Standard (29 CFR 1910.1044). 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 DBCP Standard (29 CFR 1910.1044).

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved information collection requirements.

Title: 1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane Standard.

OMB Number: 1218–0101.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; Federal government; state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 1.

Frequency: On occasion.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1.

III. Authority and Signature

Charles N. Jeffress, 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. 6–96 (62 FR 111).

Signed at Washington, D.C., on February 24, 2000.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 00–4868 Filed 2–29–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Sunshine Act Meeting; Notice of Change in Subject of Meeting

The National Credit Union Administration Board determined that its business required the deletion of the following item from the previously announced closed meeting (**Federal Register**, Vol. 65, No. 35, page 8748, February 22, 2000) scheduled for Thursday, February 24, 2000.

2. One (1) Personnel Matter. Closed pursuant to exemptions (2), (5), (6), (7) and (9)(B).

The Board voted unanimously that agency business required that this item be deleted from the closed agenda and that no earlier announcement of this change was possible.

The previously announced items were:

1. Administrative Action under Section 208 of the Federal Credit Union Act. Closed pursuant to exemptions (8), (9)(A)(ii) and (9)(B).

2. Three (3) Personnel Actions. Closed pursuant to exemptions (2), (5), (6), (7) and (9)(B).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone (703) 518–6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 00–5085 Filed 2–28–00; 3:46 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–255]

Consumers Energy Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, 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–20, issued to Consumers Energy Company for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would change Current Technical Specification (CTS) 4.9a.2, ''Auxiliary Feedwater System Tests—Surveillance Requirements—Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps,'' by removing the surveillance requirement with respect to the backup steam supply to turbine-driven auxiliary feedwater (AFW) pump P–8B. As changed, the monthly surveillance requirement would apply to the switch for the primary steam supply valve (CV–0522B) and the pump test-key switch on the automatic AFW actuation system, but not to the switch for the manual backup steam supply valve.

Related changes would also be made to the Improved Technical Specification (ITS) 3.7.5, ''Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) System,'' as issued November 30, 1999 (Amendment 189). Condition A for ITS 3.7.5 currently provides a completion time of 7 days for restoration if one of the two steam supplies for the turbine-driven AFW pump becomes inoperable (provided the other supply is operable). The proposed amendment would delete ITS 3.7.5 Condition A, and the remaining conditions and their associated actions would be relettered. ITS 3.7.5 Condition B currently allows a completion time of 72 hours for restoration of an inoperable AFW pump (provided that at least 100% of required AFW flow and at least two operable AFW pumps are available). Condition B also specifies a second completion time: ''10 days from discovery of failure to meet the LCO [limiting condition for operation].'' The proposed amendment would delete this second completion time in Condition B. The proposed amendment would also revise ITS Surveillance Requirement 3.7.5.1 to only require verification of valve alignment in the remaining steam supply to P–8B (*i.e.,* reference to the backup steam supply would be eliminated). The licensee also forwarded associated changes for the CTS and ITS Bases.

Exigent circumstances exist which cause the Commission to act promptly upon the proposed amendment request. During a maintenance outage on February 5, 2000, a steam leak developed beneath the floor of the turbine building from the underground piping that provides a manual backup steam supply to AFW pump P–8B. The licensee states that this manual backup steam supply line provides no required safety function, but it does provide an alternative steam supply to P–8B for operational flexibility. The licensee subsequently excavated the area immediately surrounding the leak and removed and replaced the leaking pipe section. Since the apparent cause of the leak was corrosion originating from the exterior of the pipe, the licensee concluded that the integrity of the remainder of the line, which has not been completely inspected, cannot be quantitatively proven and cannot easily be demonstrated to be in compliance with the requirements of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code for the entire length of underground pipe. Therefore, the licensee decided on February 13, 2000, to consider this manual backup steam supply line inoperable. Since the plant was scheduled to start up, the licensee requested in a letter and telephone call on February 16, 2000, that the Commission grant enforcement discretion to permit plant startup and subsequent operation until a TS change request could be processed. During the phone call, and in a subsequent letter dated February 18, 2000, the Commission noted its intention to exercise enforcement discretion for the period of time necessary to process a license amendment to change the TS. In its letter granting enforcement discretion, the Commission stated that the license amendment application was to be submitted no later than 12:50 p.m. on February 18, 2000. Thus, the licensee's application for amendment, dated February 18, 2000, is in response to the degraded condition of an underground pipe that is not needed for any safety function and to the Commission's actions in granting enforcement discretion.

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.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6), for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine 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:

A. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?