of the net impact of services provided by YouthBuild programs funded by the Department and the Corporation. This evaluation will offer policymakers, program administrators, service providers, future applicants, and the public information about the relative effectiveness of YouthBuild programs, how the effectiveness varies by target population, and how the services are implemented. The study will also produce estimates of the benefits and costs of these services. Compared to peers who remain in school, high school dropouts are more likely to be disconnected from school and work, be incarcerated, be unmarried, and have children outside of marriage. Thus, the evaluation represents an important opportunity to add to the growing body of knowledge about the impacts of ''second chance'' programs for youth who have dropped out of high school.

The complete experimental design impact evaluation of the YouthBuild program will take seven years, including a follow-up period that extends for four years after the last applicant is enrolled in the study and additional time for analyzing and reporting the results. The evaluation is funded by both the Department and the Corporation. It will measure core program outcomes including educational attainment, postsecondary planning, employment, earnings, personal development, delinquency and involvement with the criminal justice system. Random assignment will be conducted in approximately 60 randomly-selected DOL-funded sites and 17 randomly-selected CNCS-funded sites. Youth in those sites who are eligible for YouthBuild services will be randomly assigned to one of two groups: the program group, which can receive all YouthBuild services, and the control group, which cannot receive YouthBuild services for a 24 months after enrollment but can receive services from other organizations in their communities. In the participating YouthBuild sites, all eligible applicants for YouthBuild services will be asked to participate in the study during the 12–18 month study enrollment period. They will be informed of the evaluation, provided an opportunity to ask questions or seek clarification of their role and responsibilities should they agree to participate, and then asked to give their consent to participate. Applicants who do not consent to participate in the study will not be allowed to enroll in YouthBuild or receive services or training funded by the YouthBuild program. As will be the case for those in the control group, those who do not consent to participate in the study can receive training services from other organizations in their communities. The Department expects a total of about 4,600 YouthBuild program applicants to be randomly assigned to one of the two groups under the evaluation.

The Department has determined that it is in the public interest to use a random assignment impact methodology because random assignment is generally viewed as the best and most feasible design for credibly and reliably answering questions about the effectiveness of social programs and policy interventions. More than any other approach, random assignment minimizes the chance that any observed differences in outcomes between research groups are due to unmeasured, preexisting differences between members of the groups. When implemented carefully, random assignment creates groups that are almost identical in their characteristics before the intervention, differing only in whether they are exposed to the intervention. As a result, differences in average outcomes between the groups can be causally attributed to the intervention.

The Department recognizes that this design will assign some applicants to the control group, which will not have access to YouthBuild services. However, those who are assigned to the control group will be eligible for other services in their communities and also eligible to reapply for YouthBuild services 24 months after enrollment into the study.

To protect the rights and welfare of YouthBuild applicants who agree to participate in the evaluation, the evaluation team, lead by researchers from MDRC submitted the YouthBuild evaluation design to MDRC's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for concurrence. An IRB is a committee specifically responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of humans involved in biomedical and behavioral research. On May 3, 2011, MDRC's IRB determined this study to be of no more than minimal risk and approved it.

II. Desired Focus of Comments

Currently, DOL is soliciting comments concerning the Department's intent to carry out the random assignment study described above: for the limited enrollment period, applicants for YouthBuild services and training would be required to consent to participate in the study, where they would be randomly assigned to one of the two research groups. Applicants who do not consent to participate would be ineligible to receive YouthBuild services and training. This requirement would apply only to applicants in the limited number of YouthBuild program sites selected to participate in this evaluation.

The Department seeks comments focused on whether there is a methodology that would yield as credible and reliable an evaluation of the YouthBuild program as random assignment, but avoids adverse affect on the study participants. The Department also welcomes comments that suggest ways to more effectively minimize any adverse impact on the study participants who participate in the study described above.

III. Current Actions

Following receipt of comments in response to this request, ETA will adjust, as appropriate, the approach for temporarily requiring applicants for YouthBuild services and training at select DOL-funded and CNCS-funded sites to participate in random assignment. Comments submitted in response to this request will also become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of August, 2011.

Jane Oates,

Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–20971 Filed 8–16–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification of Application of Existing Mandatory Safety Standards

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

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 submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) by the parties listed below to modify the application of existing mandatory safety standards codified 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 September 16, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit your comments, identified by ''docket

number'' on the subject line, by any of the following methods:

1. *Electronic Mail: zzMSHA-comments@dol.gov.* Include the docket number of the petition in the subject line of the message.

2. *Facsimile:* 202–693–9441.

3. *Regular Mail:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2350, Arlington, Virginia 22209–3939, Attention: Roslyn B. Fontaine, Acting Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances.

4. *Hand-Delivery or Courier:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2350, Arlington, Virginia 22209–3939, Attention: Roslyn B. Fontaine, Acting Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances.

MSHA 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's 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: Barbara Barron, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances at 202–693–9447 (Voice), *barron.barbara@dol.gov* (E-mail), or 202–693–9441 (Facsimile). [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 modification.

II. Petitions for Modification

Docket Number: M–2011–022–C.

Petitioner: Sage Creek Coal Company, LLC, Three Gateway Center, Suite 1340, 401 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222–1000.

Mine: Peabody Sage Creek Mine, MSHA Mine I.D. No. 05–04952, located in Routt County, Colorado.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6) (Nonpermissible diesel-powered equipment; design and performance requirements.

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit an alternative method of compliance with respect to the braking systems on a grader. The petitioner states that: (1) The petition is limited in application to the diesel motorgraders. (2) The maximum speed on the Diesel Motorgraders will be limited to 10 mph by: (a) permanently blocking out the gear(s) or any gear ratio(s) that provide higher speeds. The device will limit the vehicle speed in both forward and reverse; and (b) using transmission(s) and differential(s) geared in accordance with the equipment manufacturer which limits the maximum speed to 10 mph. (3) Prior to implementing the alternative method: (a) The diesel grader will be inspected by MSHA to determine compliance with the terms and conditions; (b) grader operators will be trained to recognize appropriate levels of speed for different road conditions and slopes; (c) grader operators will be trained to lower the moldboard (grader blade) to provide additional stopping capability in emergencies; and (d) grader operators will be trained to recognize the transmission gear blocking device and its proper application requirements. (4) The grader will comply with all other applicable requirements of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and the applicable requirements of 30 CFR, parts 75 and 77. (5) Within 60 days after the proposed decision and order becomes final, the petitioner will submit proposed revisions for its approved 30 CFR part 48 training plan to the District Manager. These revisions will specify initial and refresher training regarding the terms and conditions stated in the petition. The proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection to all miners as would be provided by the standard.

Docket Number: M–2011–023–C.

Petitioner: Peabody Twentymile Mining LLC, Three Gateway Center, Suite 1340, 401 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222–1000.

Mine: Foidel Creek Mine, MSHA Mine I.D. No. 05–03836, located in Routt County, Colorado.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 75.1909(b)(6) (Nonpermissible diesel-powered equipment; design and performance requirements).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit an alternative method of compliance with respect to the braking systems on a grader. The petitioner states that: (1) The petition is limited in application to the Diesel Motorgraders. (2) The maximum speed on the Diesel Motorgraders will be limited to 10 mph by: (a) permanently blocking out the gear(s) or any gear ratio(s) that provide higher speeds. The device will limit the vehicle speed in both forward and reverse; and (b) using transmission(s) and differential(s) geared in accordance with the equipment manufacturer which limits the maximum speed to 10 mph. (3) Prior to implementing the alternative method: (a) the diesel grader will be inspected by MSHA to determine compliance with the terms and conditions; (b) grader operators will be trained to recognize appropriate levels of speed for different road conditions and slopes; (c) grader operators will be trained to lower the moldboard (grader blade) to provide additional stopping capability in emergencies; and (d) grader operators will be trained to recognize the transmission gear blocking device and its proper application requirements. (4) The grader will comply with all other applicable requirements of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and the applicable requirements of 30 CFR, Parts 75 and 77. (5) Within 60 days after the proposed decision and order becomes final, the petitioner will submit proposed revisions for its approved 30 CFR part 48 training plan to the District Manager. These revisions will specify initial and refresher training regarding the terms and conditions stated in the petition. The proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection to all miners as would be provided by the standard.

Docket Number: M–2011–005–M.

Petitioner: Troy Mine, Inc., P.O. Box 1660, Highway 56 South Mine Road, Troy, Montana 59935.

Mine: Troy Mine, MSHA Mine I.D. No. 24–01467, located in Lincoln County, Montana.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 57.11055 (Inclined escapeways).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit an alternative method of compliance to permit the use of a 317-foot portion of a designated secondary escapeway, which is steel-encased, with secure landings, and equipped with a leaky feeder communication system. The petitioner

seeks a modification of the existing standard: (1) As it pertains to a secondary escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area; (2) The secondary escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area is 42 inches in diameter and steel-encased. The escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area is equipped with a ladder and secure landings at least every 30 feet, in conformance with 30 CFR 57.11025. The secondary escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area consists of two sections. The first section is 114 feet, and the second section is 317 feet. The first section begins at the C Bed and ends at the Upper C Bed. The second section begins at the Upper C Bed and ends at the Lower Quartzite area. Refer to Attachments A and B for diagrams of the area in question; (3) The mine proposes an alternative method of compliance with the existing standard, by installation of a leaky feeder communication system in the steel-encased secondary escapeway. The alternative method provides mines in the escapeway with continuous communication with the surface and will allow for notification that personnel are in the raise and on their way out. The leaky feeder system will be protected from damage due to steel encasement of the escapeway/raisebore. The steel encasement of the escapeway/raisebore will also prevent exposure to falling rock in the secondary escapeway to miners. The landings spaced at a maximum of 30 foot intervals are configured to provide protection to resting miners from falling down the escapeway; (4) In the alternative to compliance with the existing standard, the petitioner proposes to: (a) Install a leaky feeder communication cable in the secondary escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area; (b) install radio boxes in the secondary escapeway/raisebore from the C Bed to the Lower Quartzite area. The radio boxes will each contain: (i) A radio; (ii) A charging station for the radio; and (iii) An extra battery for the radio; (c) within 45 days after the proposed decision and order becomes final, the petitioner will submit proposed revisions to the escape and evacuation plan as required in 30 CFR 57.11053; and (d) with 60 days after the proposed decision and order becomes final, the petitioner will submit proposed revisions of its approved 30 CFR part 48 training plan to the Metal/Nonmetal Safety and Health District Manager. In addition to the requirements specified, these proposed revisions will specify initial and refresher training regarding the terms and conditions stated in the proposed decision and order. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded by the existing standard.

Docket Number: M–2011–006–M.

Petitioner: Degerstrom Ventures, 3268 Blackfoot River Road, Soda Springs, Idaho 83276.

Mine: Enoch Valley Mine and South Rasmussen Mine, MSHA Mine I.D. No. 10–01702, located in Caribou County, Idaho.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 56.9300(a) (Berms or guardrails).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit the haul road to be used without berms or guardrails being provided or maintained on the banks of the roadway where a drop-off exists of sufficient grade or depth to cause a vehicle to overturn or endanger persons in equipment. The petitioner asserts that the addition of berms or guardrails to the haul road will add a substantial hazard to the safety of the haul trucks and will expose the operators of the trucks to an unnecessary, unsafe condition. The petitioner states that: (1) Its predecessor, Dravo Soda Springs, has previously obtained similar modification of 30 CFR 56.9300(a) on two previous occasions relating to other sections of the same roadway that applies to 8.6 miles of haul road covered by previous decision and orders as well as a new 3.1 mile section of roadway; and (2) The modification is needed because the mining operation is expected to be extended to a new site in the same vicinity, known as the Blackfoot Bridge Mine. The Record of Decision for the new proposed Blackfoot Bridge Mine was filed June 17, 2011, and will be covered under the same mine identification number as the Enoch Valley Mine and South Rasmussen Mine. The petitioner asserts that the use of berms or guardrails on the haul road will add a hazard to the safety of the haul trucks and will expose the operators of the trucks to unsafe conditions.

Dated: August 12, 2011.

Patricia W. Silvey,

Certifying Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–20978 Filed 8–16–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–43–P

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information

AGENCY: Marine Mammal Commission.

ACTION: Final guidelines.

SUMMARY: The Marine Mammal Commission adopts these guidelines to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by the agency in accordance with the directive issued by the Office of Management and Budget (67 FR 8452–8460), pursuant to section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael L. Gosliner, General Counsel, Marine Mammal Commission, 4340 East-West Highway, Room 700, Bethesda MD 20814; *telephone*: (301) 504–0087; *fax*: (301) 504–0099

Background

Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Pub. L. 106–554) directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines that ''provide policy and procedural guidance to federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by federal agencies.'' Pursuant to this directive, OMB issued guidelines on 22 February 2002 (67 FR 8452–8460) that direct each federal agency to (1) Issue its own guidelines ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by the agency; (2) establish administrative mechanisms to allow affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information that does not comply with the OMB guidelines or the agency's guidelines, and (3) report periodically to the director of OMB on the number and nature of complaints received by the agency regarding the accuracy of information disseminated by the agency and how such complaints were handled by the agency.

The Marine Mammal Commission was established under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to provide independent oversight of the marine mammal conservation policies and programs being carried out by federal agencies. The Commission is charged with developing, reviewing, and making recommendations on domestic and international actions and