on June 24, 2013. Supplied devices are to be loaned to the CXCoE for a period of time no less than 90 days and must be received by the CXCoE by July 1, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jack Harne, by telephone at [202] 616–2911 [Note: this is not a toll-free telephone number], or by email at jack.harne@usdoi.gov.

Greg Ridgeway, Acting Director, Deputy Director, National Institute of Justice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sheila McConnell, Deputy Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, MSHA, at McConnell.Sheila.A@doi.gov (email); 202–693–9440 (voice); or 202–693–9441 (facsimile).

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3506(c) (2)(A).


**George F. Triebsch,** Certifying Officer.

**BILLING CODE 4510–43–P**

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS), Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Plant License Renewal; Notice of Meeting**

The ACRS Subcommittee on Plant License Renewal will hold a meeting on May 22, 2013, Room T–281, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

**Thursday, May 22, 2013—1:30 p.m. Until 5:00 p.m.**

The Subcommittee will review and discuss the license renewal application and the associated draft Safety Evaluation Report (SER) with open items for the Callaway Plant, Unit 1. The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with the NRC staff, Ameren Missouri, and other interested persons regarding this matter. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the Full Committee.

Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Official (DFO), Kent Howard (Telephone 301–415–2989 or Email: Kent.Howard@nrc.gov) five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty-five hard copies of each presentation or handout should be provided to the DFO thirty minutes before the meeting. In addition, one electronic copy of each presentation should be emailed to the DFO one day before the meeting. If an electronic copy cannot be provided within this timeframe, presenters should provide the DFO with a CD containing each presentation at least thirty minutes before the meeting. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public. Detailed procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on October 18, 2012, (77 FR 64146–64147).

Detailed meeting agendas and meeting transcripts are available on the NRC Web site at [http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/acrs](http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/acrs). Information regarding topics to be discussed, changes to the agenda, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the time allotted to present oral statements can be obtained from the Web site cited above or by contacting the identified DFO.

Moreover, in view of the possibility that the schedule for ACRS meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with these references if such rescheduling would result in a major inconvenience.

If attending this meeting, please enter through the One White Flint North building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. After registering with security, please contact Mr. Theron Brown (Telephone 240–888–9835) to be escorted to the meeting room.

**Dated:** May 6, 2013.

**Antonio Dias,** Technical Advisor, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS); Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Fukushima; Notice of Meeting**

The ACRS Subcommittee on Fukushima will hold a meeting on May 23, Room T–281, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

**Thursday, May 23, 2013—8:30 a.m. Until 12:00 p.m.**

The Subcommittee will review and discuss the development of a notation paper with possible options for addressing the Near Term Task Force (NTTF) Recommendation 1: Enhanced Regulatory Framework. The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with the NRC staff, the Nuclear Energy Institute, and other interested persons regarding this matter. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the Full Committee.

Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Official (DFO), Hossein Nourbakhsh (Telephone 301–415–5622 or Email: Hossein.Nourbakhsh@nrc.gov) five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty-five hard copies of each presentation or
### APPENDIX—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA–W</th>
<th>Subject firm (petitioners)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date of institution</th>
<th>Date of petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82620</td>
<td>Hewlett-Packard Software Business Unit (State-One-Stop)</td>
<td>Andover, MA</td>
<td>04/01/13</td>
<td>03/29/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82621</td>
<td>Lionbridge Technologies (State/One-Stop)</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>04/01/13</td>
<td>03/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82622</td>
<td>ETI Precision Corp (Company)</td>
<td>Gordonsville, TN</td>
<td>04/02/13</td>
<td>04/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82623</td>
<td>Advanced Solar Photonics (ASP) (State/One-Stop)</td>
<td>Lake Mary, FL</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
<td>04/02/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82624</td>
<td>Heraeus Materials Technology LLC (Company)</td>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
<td>03/26/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82625</td>
<td>CDI Corporation (Company)</td>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>04/04/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82626</td>
<td>General Motors (Union)</td>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>04/04/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82627</td>
<td>Imation (State/One-Stop)</td>
<td>Oakdale, MN</td>
<td>04/04/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82628</td>
<td>Archetype Design, LLC (State/One-Stop)</td>
<td>Huntington Park, CA</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82629</td>
<td>Boeing Information Technology Infrastructure (State/One-Stop)</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82630</td>
<td>Astromed, Inc. Grass Technologies Division (Company)</td>
<td>Rockland, MA</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82631</td>
<td>Humana Insurance Company (Workers)</td>
<td>DePere, WI</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82632</td>
<td>Mass Design Incorporated (Company)</td>
<td>Nashua, NH</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82633</td>
<td>AK Steel—Zanesville Works (Union)</td>
<td>Zanesville, OH</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>03/21/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82634</td>
<td>Prudential Financial (Workers)</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>04/05/13</td>
<td>04/04/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Mine Safety and Health Administration**

**Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices**

**AGENCY:** Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** 60-Day Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a pre-clearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This program helps to assure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

**DATES:** All comments must be postmarked or received by midnight Eastern Standard Time on July 1, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments concerning the information collection requirements of this notice must be clearly identified with “OMB 1219–0001” and sent to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA). Comments may be sent by any of the methods listed below.


Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments for docket number [MSHA–2013–0008].

- **Regular Mail or Hand Delivery:**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sheila McConnell, Deputy Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, MSHA, at McConnell.Sheila.A@dol.gov (email); 202–693–9440 (voice); or 202–693–9441 (facsimile).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

Continuous Personal Dust Monitors (CPDMs) determine the concentration of respirable dust in coal mines. CPDMs must be designed and constructed for coal miners to wear and operate without impeding their ability to perform their work safely and effectively, and must be durable to perform reliably in normal working conditions of coal mines. Requirements for MSHA and NIOSH approval of the manufacture of CPDMs are defined in 30 CFR part 74.

Paperwork requirements imposed on applicants are related to the application process and CPDM testing procedures.

**II. Desired Focus of Comments**

The Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices. MSHA is particularly interested in comments that:

- Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility;

- Evaluate the accuracy of the MSHA’s estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

- Suggest methods to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- Address 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), to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond.

OMB clearance requests are available on MSHA’s Web site at [http://www.msha.gov](http://www.msha.gov) under “Federal Register Documents” on the right side of the screen by selecting “New and Existing Information Collections and Supporting Statements”. The document will be available on MSHA’s Web site for 60 days after the publication date of this notice, and on regulations.gov. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be made available for public inspection on regulations.gov. Questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the person listed in the FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION CONTACT section of this notice.

III. Current Actions

The information obtained from applicants will be used to determine compliance with 30 CFR part 74.

MSHA has updated the number of respondents and responses, as well as the total burden hours and burden costs supporting this information collection request. MSHA does not intend to publish the results from this information collection and is not seeking approval to either display or not display the expiration date for the OMB approval of this information collection.

There are no certification exceptions identified with this information collection and the collection of this information does not employ statistical methods.

Summary

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

Agency: Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices.

OMB Number: 1219–0147.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Cite/Reference/Form/etc: 30 CFR 74.7, 74.8, 74.11, 74.13 and 74.16.

Total Number of Respondents: 1.

Frequency: Various.

Total Number of Responses: 1.

Total Burden Hours: 41 hours.

Total Annual Respondent or Recordkeeper Cost Burden: $829,139.

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; they will also become a matter of public record.


George F. Triebisch,
Certifying Officer.
[FR Doc. 2013–10145 Filed 4–29–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4510–43–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ADVISORY

Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (#1171)

Date/Time:
May 20, 2013; 9:00 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.
May 21, 2013; 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Stafford I, Room 1235, Arlington, VA 22230

Type of Meeting: Open

Contact Person: Ms. Lisa Jones, Office of the Assistant Director, Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 905, Arlington, Virginia 22230, 703–292–8700

Summary of Minutes: May be obtained from contact person listed above.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations to the National Science Foundation on major goals and policies pertaining to Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate programs and activities.

Agenda

Tuesday, May 14, 2013
9:00 a.m.–10:00 a.m. Open—Welcome and Presentation of PFC.
10:00 a.m.–12:00 noon Closed—Science and Future plans reports.
12:00 noon–1:00 p.m. Open—Lunch with students and postdoctoral students from the PFC at JQI CSS 2115.
1:00 p.m.–5:00 p.m. Closed—Executive Sessions: Science and Future Plans Presentations, Outreach and Education, and meeting with PFC executive committee.
5:00 p.m.–6:00 p.m. Open—Poster Session Poster session in the hallways of second floor of the CSS.
6:30 p.m. Closed—Working Dinner.

Wednesday, May 15, 2013
9:00 a.m.–10:30 a.m. Closed—Executive Sessions: Meeting with Administration and PFC executive committee.
10:30 a.m.–6:00 p.m. Closed—Executive Session: Review and drafting report.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; information on personnel and proprietary data for present and future subcontracts. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), [4] and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: April 24, 2013.

Susanne Bolton,
Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 2013–10081 Filed 4–29–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIME AND DATE: 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 14, 2013.

PLACE: NTSB Conference Center, 429 L’Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20594.

STATUS: The two-item meeting is open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

8417A Marine Accident Report—Allision of the Cargo Vessel M/V Delta Mariner with Eggner’s Ferry Bridge, Tennessee River near Aurora, Kentucky, January 26, 2012


The press and public may enter the NTSB Conference Center one hour prior to the meeting for set up and seating.
NOTE TO REVIEWER

With the upcoming renewal of OMB No. 1219-0066, a non-material change will be submitted to transfer the Information Collection (IC) requirements of OMB No. 1219-0147, and when OMB No. 1219-0066 is approved a discontinuance for OMB No. 1219-0147 will be submitted.
Supporting Statement for
Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

OMB No.: 1219-0147
Title: Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices

Authority:
1. § 74.7 Design and construction requirements.
2. § 74.8 Measurement, accuracy, and reliability requirements.
3. § 74.11 Tests of the Continuous Personal Dust Monitor.
4. § 74.13 Applications.
5. § 74.16 Material required for record.

Form Number(s): None

General Instructions

A Supporting Statement, including the text of the notice to the public required by 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(i)(iv) and its actual or estimated date of publication in the Federal Register, must accompany each request for approval of a collection of information. The Supporting Statement must be prepared in the format described below, and must contain the information specified in Section A below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When Item 17 or the OMB Form 83-I is checked “Yes”, Section B of the Supporting Statement must be completed. OMB reserves the right to require the submission of additional information with respect to any request for approval.

Specific Instructions

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.

Continuous Personal Dust Monitors (CPDMs) determine the concentration of respirable dust in coal mines. CPDMs must be designed and constructed for coal
miners to wear and operate without impeding their ability to perform their work safely and effectively, and must be durable to perform reliably in normal working conditions of coal mines. Paperwork requirements imposed on applicants are related to the application process and CPDM testing procedures.

2. **Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used.** Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.

MSHA and NIOSH will use the information sent by the applicant to determine if the CPDM meets established criteria for use in underground coal mines.

3. **Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.**

MSHA accepts approval applications, correspondence and information electronically via the Internet or e-mail. Approval applicants are able to upload engineering drawings (images) and files directly to the Arlington FTP (File Transfer Protocol) site server or via the IPSO@dol.gov e-mail account. Applicants have been electronically submitting applications to MSHA since 2000.

4. **Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.**

The applications, consisting of complete scale drawings, specifications, and a description of materials, are unique to each application for approval. There is no duplication of information as a result of this collection.

5. **If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

The collection will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

6. **Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.**

Before CPDMs can be introduced in coal mines, they must be approved for use by MSHA. The approval criteria established in 30 CFR Part 74 requires manufacturers to demonstrate that CPDMs are durable enough to withstand the mine environment; can be worn by miners performing normal tasks for an entire work shift; provide accurate and precise measurements; and can be safely used in mine atmospheres where explosive mixtures of gases may occur.
If MSHA does not conduct this information collection or conducts it less frequently, the Agency may not adequately protect the health of our nation’s miners, which is required by the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:
   • requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;
   • requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;
   • requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;
   • requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;
   • in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;
   • requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
   • that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or
   • requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information’s confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

This collection of information is consistent with the guidelines in 5 C.F.R. § 1320.5.

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the data and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency’s notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years – even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior
periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

In accordance with 5 CFR 1320.8 (d), MSHA will publish the proposed information collection requirements in the Federal Register, notifying the public that these information collection requirements are being reviewed in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, and giving interested persons 60 days to submit comments.

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

MSHA has provided no payments or gifts to the respondents identified in this collection.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

There is no assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

- Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.

- If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.

- Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 13.
Section 74.13(b) requires an engineer to submit a written application for approval in duplicate to MSHA and NIOSH. MSHA estimates that it takes an engineer, earning $59.55 per hour, a total of 40 hours to prepare and compile the materials needed to accompany an application. MSHA estimates that it takes a clerical employee, earning $25.93 per hour, 0.25 hours (15 minutes) to copy and send an application. MSHA calculated hourly wages using 2011 data from InfoMine USA, Inc. Table 1 shows 41 burden hours and related costs of approximately $2,400 annually to prepare the application.

Table 1: Annual Burden Hours and Costs to Prepare Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(g)</th>
<th>(h)</th>
<th>(i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>Time to Compile Material (in hrs.)</td>
<td>Time to Copy &amp; Send Material (in hrs.)</td>
<td>No. of Copies Filed per Application</td>
<td>Burden Hours to Compile Materials for Application</td>
<td>Burden Hours to Copy and Send Materials</td>
<td>Engineer Hourly Wage Rate</td>
<td>Clerical Employees Hourly Wage Rate</td>
<td>Annual Burden Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$59.55</td>
<td>$25.93</td>
<td>$2,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Annual Costs} = (\text{col. e} \times \text{col. g}) + (\text{col. f} \times \text{col. h}). \]

Burden hours = 41
Responses = 1
Respondents = 1

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14).

- The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life); and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.

- If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day...
pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.

- Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

Sections 74.7 and 74.8 require tests that the applicant must have performed by a third party. These tests are for the following: ergonomic design (§ 74.7(b)); environmental conditions (§ 74.7(e)); electromagnetic interference (§ 74.7(f)); flow stability and calibration of pump (§ 74.7(j)); and accuracy testing, which includes reliability measurement, precision, and bias testing (§§ 74.8(c), (d), and (e)). MSHA estimates that it costs approximately $250,000 to perform these tests. MSHA’s estimate of the costs to perform these tests is based on the cost of the tests provided by MSHA’s Coal Mine Safety and Health Division.

Section 74.11 requires that the applicant submit the CPDM to MSHA for testing and evaluation, under § 18.68, to determine whether the electronic components of the CPDM submitted for approval meet the applicable permissibility requirements. The following tests would be performed by MSHA under § 18.68(a)(1): current limiting resistor adequacy test; coal dust thermal ignition test; optical isolator test; impact test and force test of encapsulated electrical assemblies; drop testing intrinsically safe apparatus; mechanical test of partitions; piezoelectric device impact test; and dielectric strength test. The battery flash current test would be performed under §§ 18.68(a)(1) and (b)(1). The methane thermal ignition test would be performed under §§ 18.68(a)(1) and (b)(6). The maximum surface temperature test would be performed under § 18.68(a)(1) and (b)(3). The spark ignition test would be performed under §§ 18.68(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(4), (a)(5), (b)(4), and (b)(5).

MSHA estimates that it will take an average of 45 hours to evaluate and 40 hours to test each application. MSHA charges an hourly fee of $97 per hour for evaluation and testing time. In addition, MSHA applies a support factor of 1.624 to its evaluation time. The support factor covers costs related to the administrative, clerical and technical support services used to evaluate applications. Table 2 shows that the estimated annual cost for MSHA to perform evaluation and testing on the application is approximately $10,969.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>Time for Evaluation (in hrs.)</td>
<td>Time for Testing (in hrs.)</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Support Factor</td>
<td>Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.624</td>
<td>$10,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Annual Costs for MSHA Evaluation and Testing
Section 74.13(b) requires an applicant to submit a written application for approval to MSHA and NIOSH in duplicate. Four copies would need to be made (2 copies for MSHA and 2 copies for NIOSH). Table 3, shows that the estimated annual costs to submit the applications are $170.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>No. of copies filed per Applicant</td>
<td>No. of pages per Application</td>
<td>Copy Cost per page</td>
<td>Postage Cost per Application</td>
<td>Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 74.16(a) requires that MSHA and NIOSH each retain one CPDM, submitted with the application. In addition, § 74.16(b) requires that NIOSH receive one commercially produced CPDM free of charge, if it is approved by NIOSH and MSHA. MSHA estimates that the cost of a CPDM could range between $8,000 and $12,000 (for an average of $10,000 per device). MSHA estimates the cost to provide two CPDMs with the application and one subsequent to the approval of the application to be $30,000.

The total costs for question 13 are $291,139 ($250,000 + $10,969 + $170 + $30,000).

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

There are no Federal costs associated with this collection of information package.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reporting in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-I.

In the previous supporting statement 41 burden hours were reported. However, on OMB Form 83-I only 40 hours were reported. This was incorrect. This renewal reports the correct burden hour estimate of 41 hours. There is no program change in this submission. The responses and respondent count both remain 1.

However, there was an increase in capital and start-up costs and operation and
maintenance costs from 289,600 to $291,139. This increase is primarily due to an increase in the average hourly rate MSHA charges for evaluation and testing. However, a portion of this increase was offset by a decrease in the average hourly rate for engineers.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation, and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

MSHA does not intend to publish the results of this information collection.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

MSHA is not seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of this information collection.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission," of OMB 83-I.

There are no certification exceptions identified with this information collection.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods.

When Item 17 on the Form OMB 83-I is checked “Yes”, the following documentation should be included in the Supporting Statement to the extent it applies to the methods proposed:

There is no statistical methodology involved in this collection.