

Comments submitted in response to this notice 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.

Dated: April 19, 2001.

Brenda C. Teaster,

Acting Director, Records Management Division.

[FR Doc. 01-10418 Filed 4-25-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Record of Individual Exposure to Radon Daughters

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure 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: Submit comments on or before June 25, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Brenda C. Teaster, Acting Chief, Records Management Division, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Room 709A, Arlington, VA 22203-1984. Commenters are encouraged to send their comments on a computer disk, or via Internet E-mail to bteaster@msha.gov, along with an original printed copy. Ms. Teaster can be reached at (703) 235-1470 (voice), or (703) 235-1563 (facsimile).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brenda C. Teaster, Acting Chief, Records

Management Division, U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Room 709A, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203-1984. Ms. Teaster can be reached at bteaster@msha.gov, (Internet E-mail), (703) 235-1470 (voice), or (703) 235-1563 (facsimile).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

MSHA's primary goal is the protection of America's most precious resource, the miner. To achieve this goal, this agency has to keep information regarding the hazards faced and the progress made within the industry to develop and maintain a safe and healthy work environment. Records concerning the health and welfare of miners are especially important, given that the nature of the exposure could result in medical complications later in the miner's life. To this end, the record keeping of Radon Daughters is essential information. Each year the industry records and reports the exposure levels that its workforce has faced during the past 12 months. This information is archived and stored for retrieval by the exposed party, or legal representative, should a medical release be deemed necessary. This reporting of the exposure numbers also serves to inform MSHA of the industry expansion or decrease as well as health threats incurred.

During the past calendar year MSHA has received a decreased number of industry responses. These responses indicated that a decreasing number of miners are being employed and exposed within this industry grouping. Concurrently, the United States economy is calling for production rates that are lower than those in recent years. The decrease in production has resulted in a smaller number of employees being exposed to Radon Daughters. Regardless of the number of miners exposed, MSHA needs to keep the recording requirements for Radon Daughters to ensure that the records regarding the miners' level of exposure today is available to them tomorrow and throughout their lifetimes.

II. Desired Focus

Currently, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting

comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to the Record of Individual Exposure to Radon Daughters. MSHA 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. A copy of the proposed information collection request may be viewed on the Internet by accessing the MSHA Home Page (<http://www.msha.gov>) and selecting "Statutory and Regulatory Information" then "Paperwork Reduction Act submission (<http://www.msha.gov/regspwork.htm>)", or by contacting the employee listed above in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice for a hard copy.

III. Current Actions

This information collection needs to be extended to provide miners protection from radon daughter exposure.

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Record of Individual Exposure to Radon Daughters.

OMB Number: 1219-0003.

Agency Number: MSHA 4000-9.

Recordkeeping: 2 years.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency (weeks)	Total responses	Average time per response (hours)	Burden
Sampling	2	50	100	5.00	500
Recording Results	2	50	100	1.50	150
Calculating Reporting	2	50	100	1.25	125

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency (weeks)	Total responses	Average time per response (hours)	Burden
Clerical	2	50	100	0.25	25
Totals	100	800

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): None.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): None.

Comments submitted in response to this notice 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.

Dated: April 20, 2001.

Brenda C. Teaster,

Acting Chief, Records Management Division.

[FR Doc. 01-10419 Filed 4-25-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Central Liquidity Facility

AGENCY: National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

ACTION: Final Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement (IRPS) 01-2, "Central Liquidity Facility Advance Policy."

SUMMARY: This policy statement clarifies the role of the Central Liquidity Facility (CLF) and the circumstances when the CLF will approve a Regular or Agent Member's request for a CLF advance.

DATES: The IRPS is effective May 29, 2001.

ADDRESSES: National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3428.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. Owen Cole, Jr., Vice President, CLF, at the above address, or telephone: (703) 518-6360 or Frank S. Kressman, Staff Attorney, at the above address, or telephone: (703) 518-6540.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The CLF operates in accordance with Title III of the Federal Credit Union Act (Act) and Part 725 of NCUA's regulations, which implements Title III. 12 U.S.C. 1795-1795k; 12 CFR part 725. It was created in 1979 to improve the general financial stability of the credit union industry by helping to meet the liquidity needs of individual credit unions. This improved stability encourages savings, supports consumer

and mortgage lending, and helps provide basic financial resources to all segments of the economy. In continuing to fulfill this mission, the CLF previously published proposed IRPS 00-2 to clarify its function and limitations in an ever-changing financial services environment. 65 FR 63892, October 25, 2000; 65 FR 65884, November 2, 2000. NCUA has received public comments on the proposal and has incorporated some of those comments into the IRPS. NCUA has renumbered IRPS 00-2 as 01-2 and adopts the below revised IRPS as final. IRPS 01-2 supersedes IRPS 80-4.

B. Summary of Comments

NCUA received thirteen comment letters regarding the proposed IRPS. Six from credit union trade associations, four from corporate credit unions, one from a natural person federal credit union, one from a banking trade association, and one from an association of state credit union supervisors. All of the commenters generally supported the proposed IRPS, except for the banking trade association. Some commenters offered suggested revisions.

Seven commenters noted that the proposed IRPS states that a CLF loan officer may require a borrowing credit union to prepare a liquidity restoration plan to detail the action and time required to restore the credit union's net funds position to the point where it is no longer dependent on CLF advances. These commenters suggested that the IRPS would be more useful if NCUA provided examples of circumstances under which a loan officer might require a plan. The loan officer's decision to require a plan is greatly dependent on the unique circumstances of the borrowing credit union. Factors that may contribute to this decision include: (1) The credit union consistently provides incomplete, vague, or untimely information needed to approve or monitor an advance; (2) the loan officer develops concerns about the borrowing credit union's financial condition and ability to repay; (3) the credit union appears to have used an advance for inappropriate purposes; and (4) the credit union appears to be unreasonably dependent on advances without making progress towards implementing

programs to manage its liquidity risk. These factors are only a few of many that a loan officer may consider before requiring a liquidity restoration plan. This clarification has been incorporated into the final IRPS.

Four commenters noted that the proposed IRPS lists examples of appropriate circumstances for seeking CLF advances. These commenters suggested that NCUA should more clearly indicate that there may also be other appropriate circumstances for seeking CLF advances in addition to those listed. NCUA acknowledges that the list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive. NCUA has incorporated this clarification into the final IRPS.

The association of state credit union supervisors suggested that NCUA should adopt a policy not to advance funds to a state chartered, federally insured credit union without first consulting with the credit union's state supervisory authority (SSA). NCUA does not believe this is an appropriate action for it to take, but recognizes that an SSA may wish to require its regulated credit unions to notify it before making application to CLF.

The banking trade association suggested that NCUA withdraw the IRPS and re-issue it as a regulation so that it would have the force of law. We note that the IRPS was issued in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and has the same force of law as a regulation. 5 U.S.C. 551. The banking trade association also stated that CLF should not provide financial assistance to financially troubled credit unions. We agree. CLF is intended only as a liquidity provider and that is how it functions. Finally, the banking trade association stated that CLF is prohibited from making advances the intent of which is to expand credit union portfolios and therefore can not make advances to address an unexpected surge of credit demands. We agree that CLF is prohibited from making advances the intent of which is to expand credit union portfolios, but believe that an unexpected surge of credit demands is a legitimate liquidity need for the CLF to meet.