*Petitioner:* Bowie Resources Limited. [Docket No.: M–1999–100–C]

FR Notice: 64 FR 57663.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6)

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternate method in lieu of front wheel brakes on diesel graders used at the Bowie No. 2 Mine. The petitioner proposes to limit the speed of the graders to 10 miles per hour by block welding a steel stop bar across the gear selector slot to the 5th and 6th gears, and train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail and on how to recognize the appropriate speeds to use on different roadway and slope conditions. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Bowie No. 2 Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Bowie No. 2 Mine with conditions.

*Petitioner:* Wabash Mine Holding Company.

[Docket No.: M-1999-107-C]

FR Notice: 64 FR 70054.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternate method in lieu of the front wheel brakes on diesel graders. The petitioner proposes to equip diesel graders with devices that limit the speed of the diesel graders to 10 miles per hour and to train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Wabash Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Wabash Mine with conditions.

Petitioner: Blue Mountain Energy, Inc.

[Docket No.: M–1999–109–C]

*FR Notice:* 64 FR 70054. *Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternate method in lieu of the front wheel brakes on diesel graders. The petitioner proposes to equip diesel graders with devices that limit the speed of the diesel graders to 10 miles per hour and to train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Deserado Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Deserado Mine with conditions.

*Petitioner:* Black Beauty Coal Company.

[Docket No.: M-1999-110-C]

*FR Notice:* 64 FR 70054. *Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6). Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternate method in lieu of the front wheel brakes on diesel graders. The petitioner proposes to limit the speed of the diesel graders to 10 miles per hour and to train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Air Quality #1 Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Air Quality 11 Mine with conditions.

*Petitioner:* Consolidation Coal Company.

[Docket No.: M-1999-119-C]

FR Notice: 64 FR 70055.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.312(c) and (d).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to test automatic closing doors and automatic fan signal devices every 31 days without shutting down the fan and without removing miners from the mine. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Shoemaker Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Shoemaker Mine for tests of: (1) The automatic fan stoppage signal device; and (2) the automatic closing air flow reversal prevention doors to be performed without shutting down the mine fan, and without removing the miners from the mine with conditions.

Petitioner: Plateau Mining Company.

[Docket No.: M-1999-137-C]

*FR Notice:* 64 FR 1914. *Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternative method in lieu of the front wheel brakes on diesel graders. The petitioner proposes to equip diesel graders with devices that limit the speed of the diesel graders to 10 miles per hour, and to train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Willow Creek Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Willow Creek Mine with conditions.

Petitioner: Lodestar Energy, Inc.

[Docket No.: M–1999–141–C]

*FR Notice:* 65 FR 1914. *Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR

75.1909(b)(6).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use an alternative method in lieu of the front wheel brakes on diesel graders. The petitioner proposes to equip the diesel grader with devices that limit the speed of the diesel grader to 10 miles per hour, and to train the diesel grader operators to drop the grader blade in the event the brakes fail. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Baker Mine. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Baker Mine with conditions.

*Petitioner:* Mallie Coal Company, Inc. [Docket No.: M–98–091–C]

FR Notice: 64 FR 2519.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR

75.380(f)(4).

Summary of Findings: Petitioner's proposal is to use one twenty or two ten-pound portable chemical fire extinguishers on each Mescher Jeep. The petitioner proposes to install one fire extinguisher in the operator's deck if two fire extinguishers are used, and install the other fire extinguisher on the jeep readily accessible to the operator. If one fire extinguisher is used, it will be installed in the operator's deck. A total of twenty pounds of fire extinguisher capability will be carried on each jeep and the operator will inspect each fire extinguisher daily prior to entering the mine. This is considered an acceptable alternative method for the Mine No. 4. MSHA grants the petition for modification for the Mine No. 4 with conditions.

[FR Doc. 01–13042 Filed 5–22–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–43–U

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. ICR-1218-0173(2001)]

### Course Evaluation Form; Extension of the Office of Management of Budget's 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 public comment concerning its request for an extension of the information-collection requirements contained in its Course Evaluation Form.

*Request for Comment:* The Agency has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

• Whether the proposed informationcollection 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. **DATES:** The public must submit written comments to the office listed under ADDRESSES on or before July 23, 2001. **ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR 1218-0173(2001), OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20201; telephone: (202) 693–2350. Commenters may transmit written comments of 10 pages or less by facsimile to: (202) 693-1648.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gail Butler, Division of Administration and Training Information, OSHA Office of Training and Education, 1555 Times Drive, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018; telephone (not toll free): (847) 297-4810; e-mail: gail.butler@osha.gov or facsimile: (847) 297-4810. A copy of the Agency's Information-Collection Request (ICR) supporting the need for information-collection requirements specified in the Course Evaluation Form is available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office, or by requesting a mailed copy from Todd Owen at (202) 693–2444. For electronic copies of this ICR, contact OSHA on the Internet at http://www.osha.gov/.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of it containing effect to reduce paperwork and respondent (e.g., employer) 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 (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 are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information burden is correct.

Section 21 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the "OSHA Act") (see 29 U.S.C. 670) authorizes the Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA" or the "Agency" to conduct training and employee education. Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of Section 21 require, respectively, that the Agency: "(C)onduct, directly or by grants or contracts,(1) education programs to

provide an adequate supply of qualified personnel to carry out the purposes of this Act, and(2) informational programs on the importance of and proper use of adequate safety and health equipment"; "(C)onduct, directly or by grants or contracts, short-term training of personnel engaged in work related to (their) responsibilities under the Act''' and "(1) provide for the establishment and supervision of programs for the education and training of employers and employees in the recognition, avoidance, and prevention of unsafe and unhealthful working conditions in employments covered by this Act, and (2) consult with and advise employers and employees, and organizations representing employers and employees as to effective means of preventing occupational injuries and illnesses.

As authorized by the appropriate provisions of section 21 of the Act, the OSHA Training Institute (the "Institute") provides basic, intermediate, and advanced training and education in occupational safety and health for federal and state compliance officers, Agency professionals and technical-support personnel, employers, employees, organizations representing employees and employers, educators who develop curricula and teach occupational safety and health courses, and representatives of professional safety and health groups. This program includes the courses on occupational safety and health provided by the Institute at its national training facility in Des Plaines, Illinois. In addition to conducting courses at the OSHA Training Institute in Des Plaines, Illinois, the Institute is also administering a program whereby several institutions in various locations throughout the United States have been authorized as OSHA Training Institute Education Centers. These Education Centers conduct a specific number of OSHA courses that are geared for private sector and other Federal Agency personnel. The goal of the Education Center program is to expand the accessibility of high-quality OSHA training courses.

All students completing training courses at the Institute and the Education Centers are requested to complete the Course Evaluation Form (OSHA Form 49, 08–98 edition) on the last day of class. Students may be Federal, state, private sector, local or tribal government employees. The Course Evaluation Form contains ten close-ended questions. The form requests participant feedback on ten elements to assess communication and accomplishment of learning objectives, course content, training environment, relevance of topics to job, effectiveness of exercises, workshops, laboratories, field trips and audiovisuals, usefulness of course materials and handouts, and overall rating of course. The feedback provides an overall impression of the student's experience for the course. Students provide more detailed feedback in the narrative sections of the form. Course Evaluation Form student input provides a standardized tool for collecting quality data that has been used to determine program successes and shortcomings. This quality data has assisted the Training Institute in directing resources where they can do the most good. All Course Evaluation Forms are reviewed by the course chairperson, instructors, the Institute Director and the supervisor responsible for that course. Ratings provide baseline data from which to draw conclusions about the effectiveness and quality of the training courses and to assess the level of student satisfaction with the course. Evaluation data is used to determine which courses may need improvement. Problem areas are noted and the supervisor discusses them with the course chairperson. Courses needing further improvement are scheduled for a more comprehensive follow-up course evaluation with recommendations for improvement. Revised courses are closely monitored to determine if problem areas have been resolved.

# **II. Proposed Actions**

OSHA proposes to extend Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the collection-ofinformation (paperwork) requirements specified in Course Evaluation Form. The Agency will summarize the comments submitted in responses to this notice, and will include this summary in its request to OMB to extend the approval of these information-collection requirements.

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

*Title:* Course Evaluation Form.

OMB Number: 1218-0173.

*Affected Public:* Individuals; business or other for-profit organizations; Federal government; State, Local, or Tribal governments.

*Number of Respondents:* 16,300. *Frequency:* On occasion.

Total Responses: 16,300.

Average Time per Response: 10 minutes.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 2,716 hours.

#### **IV. Authority and Signature**

R. Davis Layne, Acting 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 the Secretary of Labor's Order No. 3–2000 (65 FR 50017).

Dated: Signed at Washington, DC on May 18, 2001.

# R. Davis Layne,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor. [FR Doc. 01–13043 Filed 5–22–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

# NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

### National Endowment for the Arts Combined Arts Advisory Panel

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that two meetings of the Leadership Initiatives Advisory Panel to the National Council on the Arts will be held at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 2506 as follows:

Visual Arts (Creativity and Organizational Capacity categories): June 19–21, 2001, Room 716. A portion of this meeting, from 1:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on June 21st, will be open to the public for policy discussion. The remaining portions of this meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on June 19th and 20th, and from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. and 12 p.m. to 5 p.m. on June 21st, will be closed.

Opera (Creativity and Organizational Capacity categories): June 26–27, 2001, Room 714. A portion of this meeting, from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. on June 27th, will be open to the public for policy discussion. The remaining portions of this meeting, from 10 a.m. to 6:15 p.m. on June 26th, and from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on June 27th, will be closed.

The closed portions of these meetings are for the purposes of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman of May 12, 2000, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to (c)(4)(6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Any person may observe meetings, or portions thereof, of advisory panels that are open to the public, and, if time allows, may be permitted to participate in the panel's discussions at the discretion of the panel chairman and with the approval of the fulltime Federal employee in attendance.

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office of AccessAbility, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506, 202/682–5532, TDDY-TDD 202/682–5496, at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Office of Guidelines & Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call 202/682–5691.

Dated: May 17, 2001.

## Kathy Plowitz-Worden,

Panel Coordinator, Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts. [FR Doc. 01–12911 Filed 5–22–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

### NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY

#### Notice of Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Institute for Literacy (NIFL).

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the National Institute for Literacy Board (Advisory Board). This notice also describes the function of the Advisory Board. Notice of this meeting is required under Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This document is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend the meeting. **DATE AND TIME:** June 7, 2001 from 10:00 am to 5:00 pm.

ADDRESSES: National Institute for Literacy, 1775 I Street, NW., Suite 730, Washington, DC 20006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shelly Coles, Executive Assistant, National Institute for Literacy, 1775 I Street, NW., Suite 730, Washington, DC 20006. Telephone number (202) 233– 2027, email scoles@nifl.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Advisory Board is established under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Title II of Public Law 105-220, Sec. 242, the National Institute for Literacy. The Advisory Board consists of ten individuals appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Advisory Board is established to advise and make recommendations to the Interagency Group, composed of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, which administers the National Institute for Literacy (Institute). The Interagency Group considers the Advisory Board's recommendations in planning the goals of the Institute and in the implementation of any programs to achieve the goals of the Institute. Specifically, the Advisory Board performs the following function (a) Makes recommendations concerning the appointment of the Director and the staff of the Institute; (b) provides independent advice on operation of the

Institute; and (c) receives reports from the Interagency Group and Director of the Institute. In addition, the Institute consults with the Advisory Board on the award of fellowships. The National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board meeting on June 7, 2001, will focus on future and current NIFL programs activities, and other relevant literacy activities and issues. Records are kept of all Advisory Board proceedings and are available for public inspection at the National Institute for Literacy, 1775 I Street, NW., Suite 730, Washington, DC 20006, from 8:30 am to 5 pm.

Dated: May 14, 2001.

# Carolyn Y. Staley,

Acting Executive Director. [FR Doc. 01–12994 Filed 5–22–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6055–01–M

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on June 6–8, 2001, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Friday, November 17, 2000 (65 FR 69578).

### Wednesday, June 6, 2001

8:30 a.m.–8:35 a.m.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:35 a.m.-11:20 a.m.: Proposed Risk-Informed Revisions to 10 CFR 50.46 and Proposed Revisions to the Framework for Risk-Informing the Technical Requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding proposed risk-informed revisions to 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors," and proposed revisions to the framework for risk-informing the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50.

11:20 a.m.–12:15 p.m.: Potential Margin Reductions Associated with Power Uprates (Open)—The Committee will hear a presentation by and hold discussions with ACRS Senior Fellow, Dr. A. W. Cronenberg, regarding his