

will make it possible to compare the outcomes of the three ITA approaches and evaluate their cost-effectiveness at three to five years after random assignment. These comparisons will be based on the experiences and outcomes of ITA customers, such as participation in education and training, employment and earnings, and participation in government support programs. These comparisons will yield estimates of the relative impacts of different ITA approaches on key outcomes in the long-term.

To compare the three ITA approaches, administrative and survey data to compute summary statistics, such as means, separately for each ITA approach will be used. For example, the percentage of ITA customers served by each approach that received training-related services will be computed and compared to how much training they received. This percentage will be compared across approaches to determine whether the different approaches vary in the amount and type of training that customers completed.

The evaluation findings can provide local workforce investment boards with guidance on possible modifications to their ITA programs. The goal of the experiment is to determine the relative long-term impacts and cost-effectiveness of different approaches to administering ITAs. The updated data collected from states and the second participant follow-

up survey will provide critical information to make those assessments. The planned data collection efforts are therefore essential to evaluating the different ITA approaches tested in the experiment.

## II. Review Focus

Data will be collected from study participants only once. The survey will provide the only source of long-term data for ITA customers at the six grantees on the following outcomes:

- Participation in education and training programs;
- Job search behavior after random assignment;
- Characteristics of post-training jobs; and
- Participation in government programs, including UI.

Therefore, if this second follow-up survey were not conducted, the evaluation would be unable to assess the impacts of different ITA approaches on these outcomes in the long-term.

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary 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.

## III. Current Actions

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection with revisions.

*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration.

*Title:* Extension of the Evaluation of the Individual Training Account Experiment.

*OMB Number:* 1205-0441.

*Affected Public:* Individuals.

*Total Respondents:* 3,366.

*Frequency:* One time.

*Total Responses:* 3,366.

*Average Time per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 1,680 hours.

*Total Burden Cost:* \$24,192.

Cite/Reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Average time per response (minutes)	Burden (hours)
ITA Follow-up survey .....	3,366	One time .....	30	1,680
Totals .....	3,366	.....	.....	1,680

The total burden cost represents 30 minutes to complete the survey multiplied by the number of completers (3,366 or 70 percent of the 4,800 sample targeted for the survey) and by an estimated average hourly wage of \$14.40 per hour.

Comments submitted in response to this comment request will be summarized and/or 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.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 16th day of July 2008.

**Thomas M. Dowd,**

*Administrator, Office of Policy Development and Research Employment and Training Administration.*

[FR Doc. E8-16666 Filed 7-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Mine Safety and Health Administration

#### Petitions for Modification

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

**ACTION:** Notice of petitions for modification of existing mandatory safety standards.

**SUMMARY:** Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and 30 CFR part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification. This notice is a summary of petitions for modification filed by the parties listed below to modify the application of existing mandatory safety standards published in Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

**DATES:** All comments on the petitions must be received by the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances on or before August 21, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit your comments, identified by "docket number" on the subject line, by any of the following methods:

1. *Electronic mail:* Standards-Petitions@dol.gov.

2. *Facsimile:* 1-202-693-9441.

3. *Regular Mail:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2349, Arlington, Virginia 22209, *Attention:* Patricia W. Silvey, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances.

4. *Hand-Delivery or Courier:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2349, Arlington, Virginia 22209, *Attention:* Patricia W. Silvey, Director,

Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances.

We will consider only comments postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service or proof of delivery from another delivery service such as UPS or Federal Express on or before the deadline for comments. Individuals who submit comments by hand-delivery are required to check in at the receptionist desk on the 21st floor.

Individuals may inspect copies of the petitions and comments during normal business hours at the address listed above.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lawrence D. Reynolds, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances at 202-693-9449 (Voice), [reynolds.lawrence@dol.gov](mailto:reynolds.lawrence@dol.gov) (E-mail), or 202-693-9441 (Telefax), or contact Barbara Barron at 202-693-9447 (Voice), [barron.barbara@dol.gov](mailto:barron.barbara@dol.gov) (E-mail), or 202-693-9441 (Telefax). [These are not toll-free numbers.]

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (Mine Act) allows the mine operator or representative of miners to file a petition to modify the application of any mandatory safety standard to a coal or other mine if the Secretary determines that: (1) An alternative method of achieving the result of such standard exists which will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners of such mine by such standard; or (2) that the application of such standard to such mine will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in such mine. In addition, the regulations at 30 CFR 44.10 and 44.11 establish the requirements and procedures for filing petitions for modifications.

##### II. Petitions for Modification

*Docket Number:* M-2008-033-C.

*Petitioner:* Penn View Mining, Inc., 2340 Smith Road, Shelocta, Pennsylvania 15774.

*Mine:* TJS #6 Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-09464, located in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.503 (Permissible electric face equipment; maintenance) and 30 CFR 18.35 (Portable trailing cables and cords).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit the cable length to be increased for cable supplying power to two Fletcher Roof Ranger II Roof Bolters. The voltage for these machines

is 480-volts, three-phase alternating current. *The petitioner states that:* (1) The maximum length of the 480-volt trailing cables be increased to 1200 feet when No. 2 American Wire Gauge (AWG) cable is being used, and the maximum length of the 480-volt trailing cable be 950 feet when No. 4 AWG cable is being used; (2) the trailing cables for the 480-volt Fletcher Roof Ranger II Roof Bolters will not be smaller than No. 4 AWG cable; (3) all circuit breakers used to protect the No. 2 AWG trailing cable or the No. 4 AWG trailing cable exceeding 700 feet in length will have instantaneous trip units calibrated to trip at 500 amperes; (4) the trip setting for these circuit breakers will be sealed to ensure that the settings on these breakers cannot be changed, and each one will have permanent legible labels identifying the circuit breakers as being suitable for protecting the cables as listed above; (5) replacement circuit breakers and/or instantaneous trip units used to protect the No. 2 AWG trailing cable or the No. 4 AWG trailing cable will be calibrated to trip at 500 amperes, and this setting will be sealed; (6) all components that provide short-circuit protection will have a sufficient interruption rating in accordance with the maximum calculated fault currents available; (7) during each production day the trailing cables and the circuit breakers will be examined in accordance with all 30 CFR provisions; (8) permanent labels to warn miners not to change or alter the settings of these devices will be installed and maintained on the load center identifying the location of each short-circuit protective device; and (9) if the affected trailing cables are damaged in any way during the shift, the cable will be de-energized and repairs will be made. Persons may review a complete description of petitioner's alternative method and procedures at the MSHA address listed in this notice. The petitioner states that the alternative method will not be implemented until all miners designated to operate the Roof Ranger II or any other person designated to examine the trailing cables or trip settings on the circuit breakers have received proper training. *The training for the miners will include the following elements:* (1) Training in the hazards of setting the short-circuit interrupting device(s) too high to adequately protect the trailing cables; (2) training on how to verify that the circuit interrupting device(s) protecting the trailing cable(s) are properly set and maintained; (3) training in mining methods and operating procedures for protecting the trailing cables against damage; and (4)

training in the proper procedures for examining the trailing cables to ensure that the cables are in safe operating conditions by a visual inspection of the entire cable, observing the insulation, the integrity of the splices, and nicks and abrasions. The petitioner further states that within 60 days after the Proposed Decision and Order becomes final, the proposed revisions for its approved 30 CFR part 48 training plan will be submitted to the District Manager. These proposed revisions will specify task training for miners designated to examine the trailing cables for safe operating conditions, and verify that the short-circuit settings of the circuit interrupting device(s) that protect the affecting trailing cables do not exceed the specified setting(s). The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners by such standard with no diminution of safety to the miners.

*Docket Number:* M-2008-034-C.

*Petitioner:* Rosebud Mining Company, 301 Market Street, Kittanning, Pennsylvania 16201.

*Mines:* Beaver Valley Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08725, located in Beaver County, Pennsylvania; Clementine Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08862 and Logansport Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08841, located in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania; Little Toby Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08847, located in Elk County, Pennsylvania; Lowry Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-09287 and Toms Run Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08525, located in Indiana County, Pennsylvania; Mine 78, MSHA I.D. No. 36-09371, located in Somerset County, Pennsylvania; Penfield Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-09355, located in Clearfield County, Pennsylvania; and Tusky Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 33-04509, located in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.1100-2(e)(2) (Quantity and location of firefighting equipment).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit an alternate method of compliance with the firefighting equipment requirement at temporary electrical installations. The petitioner proposes to supply two fire extinguishers or one fire extinguisher of twice the required capacity at all temporary electrical installations in lieu of 240 pounds of rock dust. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners by such standard with no diminution of safety to the miners.

*Docket Number:* M-2008-035-C.  
*Petitioner:* Jim Walter Resources, Inc.,  
P.O. Box 133, Brookwood, Alabama  
35444.

*Mine:* No. 4 Mine, MSHA I.D. No.  
01-01247 and No. 7 Mine, MSHA I.D.  
No. 01-01401, both located in  
Tuscaloosa County, Alabama.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 50.30  
(Preparation and submission of MSHA  
Form 7000-2—Quarterly Employment  
and Coal Production Report).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner  
requests a modification of the existing  
standard to permit MSHA Form 7000-  
2 to be completed and submitted within  
60 days after the end of each calendar  
quarter. The petitioner asserts that the  
proposed alternative method will at all  
times guarantee no less than the same  
measure of protection afforded the  
miners by the standard.

*Docket Number:* M-2008-036-C.  
*Petitioner:* AMFIRE Mining Company,  
LLC, One Energy Place, Latrobe,  
Pennsylvania 15650.

*Mine:* Gillhouser Run Mine, MSHA  
I.D. No. 36-09033, located in Indiana  
County, Pennsylvania.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.500(d)  
(Permissible electric equipment).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner  
requests a modification of the existing  
standard to permit an alternative  
method to use low-voltage or battery-  
powered non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment in or inby the last  
open crosscut, or within 150 feet of  
pillar workings under controlled  
conditions for surveying and mapping  
of the working section, and for final  
surveying in the return areas of the  
mine. The petitioner seeks modification  
of 30 CFR 75.500(d) and any other  
applicable standards as they pertain to  
restricting the use of non-permissible or  
non-intrinsically safe electrical testing  
and diagnostic equipment used by  
maintenance personnel for trouble  
shooting and repair of mining  
equipment commonly used and  
accepted which may include, but is not  
limited to: Low-voltage or battery-  
powered non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment, portable battery  
operated hand drills, portable battery  
operated mine transits, electronic  
distance meters, and other equipment  
that may have to be used including but  
not limited to tools such as laptop  
computers. *The petitioner states that:* (1)  
Application of the existing standard will  
result in a diminution of safety to the  
miners; (2) mining equipment by its  
nature, size, complexity of mine plans,  
and relative closeness to other  
abandoned mines requires that accurate  
and precise measurements be completed

in a prompt and efficient manner; (3) all  
non-permissible electronic surveying  
equipment used in or inby the last open  
crosscut shall be examined prior to use  
to ensure that the equipment is being  
maintained in safe operating conditions;  
(4) the equipment will be examined at  
intervals not to exceed 7 days by a  
qualified person as defined in 30 CFR  
75.153; (5) examination results will be  
recorded in the weekly examination of  
electrical equipment book; (6) a  
qualified person as defined in 30 CFR  
75.151 will continuously monitor for  
methane immediately before and during  
the use of non-permissible electronic  
test and diagnostic equipment in or inby  
the last open crosscut, in return areas,  
or within 150 feet of pillar workings; (7)  
if 1.0 percent or more of methane is  
detected, non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment will be de-  
energized immediately and will be  
withdrawn outby the last open crosscut  
to intake air, or to a minimum of 150  
feet outby the pillar workings; (8) all  
hand-held methane detectors will be  
MSHA-approved and maintained in  
permissible and proper operating  
condition as defined under 30 CFR  
75.320; (9) qualified personnel engaged  
in the use of electronic surveying  
equipment will be properly trained to  
recognize the hazards and limitations  
associated with the use of such  
equipment; and (10) all electronic  
surveying equipment will be used in  
accordance with the manufacturer's  
recommended safe use procedures.  
Persons may review a complete  
description of petitioner's alternative  
method and procedures at the MSHA  
address listed in this notice. The  
petitioner asserts that the proposed  
alternative method will at all times  
guarantee no less than the same measure  
of protection afforded the miners by  
such standard.

*Docket Number:* M-2008-037-C.

*Petitioner:* AMFIRE Mining Company,  
LLC, One Energy Place, Latrobe,  
Pennsylvania 15650.

*Mine:* Madison Mine, MSHA I.D. No.  
36-09127, located in Cambria County,  
Pennsylvania.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.500(d)  
(Permissible electric equipment).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner  
requests a modification of the existing  
standard to permit an alternative  
method to use low-voltage or battery-  
powered non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment in or inby the last  
open crosscut, or within 150 feet of  
pillar workings under controlled  
conditions for surveying and mapping  
of the working section, and for final  
surveying in the return areas of the

mine. The petitioner seeks modification  
of 30 CFR 75.500(d) and any other  
applicable standards as they pertain to  
restricting the use of non-permissible or  
non-intrinsically safe electrical testing  
and diagnostic equipment used by  
maintenance personnel for trouble  
shooting and repair of mining  
equipment commonly used and  
accepted which may include, but is not  
limited to: Low-voltage or battery-  
powered non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment, portable battery  
operated hand drills, portable battery  
operated mine transits, electronic  
distance meters, and other equipment  
that may have to be used including but  
not limited to tools such as laptop  
computers. *The petitioner states that:* (1)  
Application of the existing standard will  
result in a diminution of safety to the  
miners; (2) mining equipment by its  
nature, size, complexity of mine plans,  
and relative closeness to other  
abandoned mines requires that accurate  
and precise measurements be completed  
in a prompt and efficient manner; (3) all  
non-permissible electronic surveying  
equipment used in or inby the last open  
crosscut shall be examined prior to use  
to ensure that the equipment is being  
maintained in safe operating conditions;  
(4) the equipment will be examined at  
intervals not to exceed 7 days by a  
qualified person as defined in 30 CFR  
75.153; (5) examination results will be  
recorded in the weekly examination of  
electrical equipment book; (6) a  
qualified person as defined in 30 CFR  
75.151 will continuously monitor for  
methane immediately before and during  
the use of non-permissible electronic  
test and diagnostic equipment in or inby  
the last open crosscut, in return areas,  
or within 150 feet of pillar workings; (7)  
if 1.0 percent or more of methane is  
detected, non-permissible electronic  
surveying equipment will be de-  
energized immediately and will be  
withdrawn outby the last open crosscut  
to intake air, or to a minimum of 150  
feet outby the pillar workings; (8) all  
hand-held methane detectors will be  
MSHA-approved and maintained in  
permissible and proper operating  
condition as defined under 30 CFR  
75.320; (9) qualified personnel engaged  
in the use of electronic surveying  
equipment will be properly trained to  
recognize the hazards and limitations  
associated with the use of such  
equipment; and (10) all electronic  
surveying equipment will be used in  
accordance with the manufacturer's  
recommended safe use procedures.  
Persons may review a complete  
description of petitioner's alternative  
method and procedures at the MSHA

address listed in this notice. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners by such standard.

*Docket Number:* M-2008-038-C.

*Petitioner:* AMFIRE Mining Company, LLC, One Energy Place, Latrobe, Pennsylvania 15650.

*Mine:* Nolo Mine, MSHA I.D. No. 36-08850, located in Indiana County, Pennsylvania.

*Regulation Affected:* 30 CFR 75.500(d) (Permissible electric equipment).

*Modification Request:* The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit an alternative method to use low-voltage or battery-powered non-permissible electronic surveying equipment in or inby the last open crosscut, or within 150 feet of pillar workings under controlled conditions for surveying and mapping of the working section, and for final surveying in the return areas of the mine. The petitioner seeks modification of 30 CFR 75.500(d) and any other applicable standards as they pertain to restricting the use of non-permissible or non-intrinsically safe electrical testing and diagnostic equipment used by maintenance personnel for troubleshooting and repair of mining equipment commonly used and accepted which may include, but is not limited to: Low-voltage or battery-powered non-permissible electronic surveying equipment, portable battery operated hand drills, portable battery operated mine transits, electronic distance meters, and other equipment that may have to be used including but not limited to tools such as laptop computers. *The petitioner states that:* (1) Application of the existing standard will result in a diminution of safety to the miners; (2) mining equipment by its nature, size, complexity of mine plans, and relative closeness to other abandoned mines require that accurate and precise measurements be completed in a prompt and efficient manner; (3) all non-permissible electronic surveying equipment used in or inby the last open crosscut shall be examined prior to use to ensure that the equipment is being maintained in safe operating conditions; (4) the equipment will be examined at intervals not to exceed 7 days by a qualified person as defined in 30 CFR 75.153; (5) examination results will be recorded in the weekly examination of electrical equipment book; (6) a qualified person as defined in 30 CFR 75.151 will continuously monitor for methane immediately before and during the use of non-permissible electronic

test and diagnostic equipment in or inby the last open crosscut, in return areas, or within 150 feet of pillar workings; (7) if 1.0 percent or more of methane is detected, non-permissible electronic surveying equipment will be de-energized immediately and will be withdrawn outby the last open crosscut to intake air, or to a minimum of 150 feet outby the pillar workings; (8) all hand-held methane detectors will be MSHA-approved and maintained in permissible and proper operating condition as defined under 30 CFR 75.320; (9) qualified personnel engaged in the use of electronic surveying equipment will be properly trained to recognize the hazards and limitations associated with the use of such equipment; and (10) all electronic surveying equipment will be used in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended safe use procedures. Persons may review a complete description of petitioner's alternative method and procedures at the MSHA address listed in this notice. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners by such standard.

**Lawrence D. Reynolds,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances.*

[FR Doc. E8-16669 Filed 7-21-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-43-P**

## MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

[MCC FR 08-07]

### Notice of Entering Into a Compact With the Government of Burkina Faso

**AGENCY:** Millennium Challenge Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with Section 610(b)(2) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-199, Division D), the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is publishing a summary and the complete text of the Millennium Challenge Compact between the United States of America, acting through the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Government of Burkina Faso. Representatives of the United States Government and the Government of Burkina Faso executed the Compact documents on July 14, 2008.

Dated: July 17, 2008.

**William G. Anderson Jr.,**

*Vice President & General Counsel, Millennium Challenge Corporation.*

### Summary of Millennium Challenge Compact With the Government of Burkina Faso

#### A. Introduction

Burkina Faso is a landlocked country in Africa's Sahel region, bordering Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Niger, and Togo, with a population of approximately 15.26 million people. It is one of the poorest countries in the world, ranking 176 out of 177 countries as surveyed by the United Nations Development Program's 2007 Human Development Index. In an effort to address constraints to investment, Burkina Faso has undertaken several broad macroeconomic reforms since the mid-1990s, including market-oriented reforms, decentralization of power from the central government to local governments, adoption of a new labor code, and business climate improvements. In light of these efforts, in 2007, the International Finance Corporation named Burkina Faso one of the top reformers in West Africa. In January 2008, Burkina Faso began a two-year term on the United Nations Security Council. Despite these reforms, recognitions, and moderate economic gains, Burkina Faso continues to face severe constraints to growth and poverty reduction.

#### B. Program Overview, Budget, and Impact

Constraints are particularly acute in rural areas. Agricultural activities involve 85 percent of the country's active population and contribute to approximately 36 percent of GDP and 88 percent of export earnings. Rural populations in Burkina Faso currently lack access to basic inputs needed to improve agricultural and livestock productivity, including secure land, skilled labor, adequate water resources, sufficient volumes of credit, and adequate access to markets. To address these constraints, the government of Burkina Faso ("GoBF") has proposed a US\$480,943,569, five-year Millennium Challenge Compact ("Compact") that will consist of four interdependent projects:

- Rural Land Governance Project—designed to increase investment in land and rural productivity through improved land tenure security and land management;
- Agriculture Development Project—designed to expand the productive use of land in order to increase the volume