693–2222. A copy of the Agency's Information-Collection Request (ICR) supporting the need for the collections of information collection specified by the Standard on Permit-Required Confined Spaces is available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office, or by requesting a copy from Theda Kenney at (202) 693–2222, or Todd Owen at (202) 693–2444. For electronic copies of the ICR, contact OSHA on the Internet at *http://www.osha.gov* and select ''*Information Collection Requests.*''

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. 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 costs) is minimal, collection instruments are understandable, and OSHA's estimate of the information-collection burden is correct.

The following sections describe who uses the information collected under each requirement, as well as how they use it. The purpose of the information is to insure that employers systematically evaluate the dangers in permit spaces before entry is attempted and to insure that adequate measures are taken to make the spaces safe for entry. In addition, the information is needed to determine, during an OSHA inspection by a compliance safety and health officer, if employers are in compliance with the standard.

Section 1910.146(c)(2) requires the employer to post danger signs to inform exposed employees of the existence and location of and the danger posed by permit spaces.

Section 1910.146(c)(4) requires the employer to develop and implement a written permit space program if the employer decides that its employees will enter permit spaces. The written program is to be made available for inspection by employees and their authorized representatives. Section 1910.146(d) provides the employer with the requirements of permit-required confined space program (permit space program) required under this paragraph.

Section 1910.146(c)(5)(i)(E) requires that the determinations and supporting data required by paragraphs (c)(5)(i)(A), (c)(5)(i)(B), and (c)(5)(i)(C) of this section are documented by the employer and are made available to each employee who enters a permit space or to that employee's authorized representative.

Under paragraph (c)(5)(ii)(H) of 1910.146, the employer is required to verify that the space is safe for entry and that the pre-entry measures required by paragraph (c)(5)(ii) of this section have been taken, through a written certification that contains the date, the location of the space, and the signature of the person providing the certification. The certification is to be made before entry and is required to be made available to each employee entering the space or to that employee's authorized representative.

Section 1910.146(c)(7)(iii) requires the employer to document the basis for determining that all hazards in a permit space have been eliminated, through a certification that contains the date, the location of the space, and the signature of the person making the determination. The certification is to be made available to each employee entering the space or to that employee's authorized representative.

Section 1910.146(e) requires the employer to document the completion of measures required by paragraph (d)(3) by preparing an entry permit before employee entry is authorized. Paragraph (e)(3) requires that the employer make the completed permit available at the time of entry to all authorized entrants by posting the permit at the entry portal or by any other equally effective means, so that the entrants can confirm that pre-entry preparations have been completed. Paragraph (e)(6) requires the employer to retain each canceled entry permit for at least one year.

Section 1910.146(g)(4) requires that the employer certify that the training required by paragraphs (g)(1) through (g)(3) [1] has been accomplished by preparing a written certification record.

II. 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, 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.

[1] The Agency concludes that the training required under 1910.146(g)(1) through (g)(3) is written in performance-oriented language and, thus, not considered a collection of information under the implementing rules and guidelines of PRA–95.

III. Proposed Actions

OSHA proposes to extend the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval of the collection-of-information requirements specified by the Standard on Permit-Required Confined Spaces (29 CFR 1910.146). The Agency will summarize the comments submitted in response 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 a currently-approved information-collection requirement.

Title: Permit-Required Confined Spaces (29 CFR 1910.146).

OMB Number: 1218–0203.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; Federal government; State, local, or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 4,844,849.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: On occasion.

Average time per Response: Varies from three minutes (.05 hour) to maintain and disclose a training certification to 16 hours to develop a written permit space entry program.

Total Annual Hours Requested: 1,666,663.

Total Annual Costs (O&M): $0.

IV. 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. 3–2000 (65 FR 50017).

Signed at Washington, DC on June 25, 2002.

John L. Henshaw,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 02–16333 Filed 6–27-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (02–078)]

NASA Advisory Council; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council.

DATES: Wednesday, July 10, 2002, 9 a.m. to Noon.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, James F. Webb Memorial Auditorium (West Lobby), 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Donald Miller, Code IC, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358–1647.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be conducted by teleconference in a room accessible to the public. The agenda for the meeting is for the Research Maximization Prioritization (REMAP) Task Force to present its findings and recommendations to the NAC for its deliberations prior to submission of the report to the NASA Administrator.

Dated: June 21, 2002.

Sylvia K. Kraemer,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–16315 Filed 6–27–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee Management; Notice of Establishment

The Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation has determined that the establishment of the Advisory Committee for GPRA Performance Assessment is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Name of Committee: Advisory Committee for GPRA Performance Assessment (#13853).

Purpose: Advise NSF on GPRA planning, procedures and assessment as they relate to the Foundation's long-term strategic outcome goals, and provide NSF with a report that contains recommendations related to GPRA reporting by NSF

Responsible NSF Official: Thomas N. Cooley, Chief Financial Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 405, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: 703/292–8200.

Dated: June 24, 2002.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–16314 Filed 6–27–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–298]

Cooper Nuclear Station; 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–46, issued to Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee), for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to support increase in reactor equipment cooling water temperature limits of service water (SW) and ultimate heat sink (UHS).

On May 20, 2002, the licensee submitted its application for change, and requested that the application be reviewed and approved by July 10, 2002. During telephone conversations with the licensee, the NRC staff explained that **Federal Register** notice requirements of 30 day comment period would push the earliest approval date to July 25, 2002. The licensee stated that anticipated low Missouri River (UHS for CNS) water flows and warm summer temperatures are likely to lead to the river water temperature to exceed the current UHS temperature limit of the TS, which would require a plant shutdown. Therefore, by a letter dated June 19, 2002, the licensee has asked that its application of May 20, 2002, be processed as an exigent request, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6), so as to avoid unnecessary shutdown of the CNS.

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:

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The effects of the proposed increase in the SW and reactor equipment cooling [REC] temperatures on the likelihood of postulated accidents have been considered. These temperature parameters are not precursors or initiators of any analyzed Design Basis Events [DBEs]. Furthermore, there are no plant hardware changes or new operator actions associated with this proposed change that could serve to initiate a DBE. Accordingly, there is no increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The potential impact of the proposed increase in the SW and REC temperatures on the ability of the plant to mitigate postulated accidents has been analyzed. This includes analysis of the following fourteen (14) areas: (1) The ability of the containment to provide adequate long term (greater than 10 minutes) cooling following a design basis loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA); (2) the ability to safely shutdown the plant from outside the control room after a fire; (3) the ability of the plant to mitigate an Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS) event; (4) the adequacy of the water source at the suction of the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) pumps [i.e. the availability of adequate Net Positive Suction Head (NPSH)]; (5) the ability of the suppression pool to provide a source of water for the ECCS pumps without allowing ingestion of steam bubbles by the pumps; (6) small steam line break; (7) Diesel Generator cooling; (8) ability of SW to remove heat from REC and ability of REC to provide ECCS area cooling; (9) SW as a source of backup water to REC; (10) ability to meet requirements of environmental qualification of electrical equipment; (11) the adequacy of the water source (i.e. availability of adequate NPSH) at the suction of the SW and REC pumps; (12) impact on ECCS piping; (13) impact on the seals in the Residual Heat Removal and Core Spray pumps; and (14) common mode failure analysis on SW pump room maximum allowed temperature.

These analyses demonstrate that adequate cooling can be achieved and postulated accidents can be properly mitigated with the SW and REC systems at the proposed increased temperatures. In some analyzed accidents the proposed increased SW and