

Workers' Compensation (DCMWC) each policy and endorsement issued, cancelled, or renewed with respect to responsible operators. It states that this report will be made in such a manner and on such a form as DCMWC may require. The CM-921 is the form completed by the insurance carrier and forwarded to DCMWC for review. It is also required that if a policy is issued or renewed for more than one operator, a separate report for each operator shall be submitted. This information collection is currently approved for use through March 31, 2007.

II. *Review Focus:* 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:* The Department of Labor seeks approval for the extension of this information collection in order to identify operators who have secured insurance for payment of black lung benefits as required by the Act.

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Agency:* Employment Standards Administration.

*Title:* Notice of Issuance of Insurance Policy.

*OMB Number:* 1215-0059.

*Agency Number:* CM-921.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for profit; Federal Government and State, Local or Tribal Government.

*Total Respondents:* 60.

*Total Responses:* 4,000.

*Time per Response:* 10 minutes.

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 667.

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* \$0.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance):* \$1,880.00.

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: September 28, 2006.

**Ruben Wiley,**

*Chief, Branch of Management Review and Internal Control, Division of Financial Management, Office of Management, Administration and Planning, Employment Standards Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-16277 Filed 10-2-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-CK-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Mine Safety and Health Administration

#### Petition for Modification

The following party has filed a petition to modify the application of an existing safety standard under section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and 30 CFR part 44.

#### Monterey Coal Company

[Docket No. M-2006-066-C]

Monterey Coal Company, 14300 Brushy Mound Road, Carlinville, Illinois 62626 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.364(b)(1) (Weekly examination) to its No. 1 Mine (MSHA I.D. No. 11-00726) located in Macoupin County, Illinois. The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to allow evaluation points to be used to examine inaccessible areas of the air courses in the same proximate location where the ventilating air enters and exits the inaccessible areas. The petitioner proposes to install an automatic sensing system at the exit points. The petitioner states that: (1) The inaccessible areas of the affected air course have numerous falls up to 50 feet high; (2) rehabilitation of an entry or removal of stoppings to make parallel entries common will be hazardous to miners due to unstable roof conditions; and (3) use of evaluation points and automatic sensors to examine these areas will provide a safe method of examination in the air courses. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as the existing standard.

#### Request for Comments

Persons interested in these petitions are encouraged to submit comments via e-mail to [Standards-Petitions@dol.gov](mailto:Standards-Petitions@dol.gov). Include "petitions for modification" in the subject line of the e-mail. Comments can also be submitted by fax, regular mail, or hand-delivery. If faxing your comments, include "petitions for modification" on the subject line of the

fax. Comments by regular mail or hand-delivery should be submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2350, Arlington, Virginia 22209. If hand-delivered, you are required to stop by the 21st floor to check in with the receptionist. All comments must be postmarked or received by the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances on or before November 2, 2006. Copies of the petitions are available for inspection at that address.

Dated at Arlington, Virginia, this 27th day of September 2006.

**Cherie A. Hutchison,**

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

[FR Doc. E6-16308 Filed 10-2-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-43-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Mine Safety and Health Administration

#### Petitions for Modification

The following parties have filed petitions to modify the application of existing safety standards under section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and 30 CFR part 44.

#### 1. Jim Walter Resources, Inc.

[Docket No. M-2006-062-C]

Jim Walter Resources, Inc., P.O. Box 133, Brookwood, Alabama 35444 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1711-1 (Sealing of shaft openings) to its No. 4 Mine (MSHA I.D. No. 01-01247), No. 5 Mine (MSHA I.D. No. 01-01322), and No. 7 Mine (MSHA I.D. No. 01-01401) all located in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama. The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to eliminate the requirement to cap shafts with vent pipes. The petitioner states that in previous experiences of equipping caps with vent pipes, in some instances, methane was believed to have existed within the explosive range immediately beneath the cap and oxygen was present in sufficient quantities to support an ignition or an explosion. The petitioner states that to equip caps with vent pipes will be more detrimental to miners' safety and health than the current proposal. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as the existing standard.