

NY970073 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 NY970075 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 NY970076 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume II

District of Columbia

DC970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 DC970003 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Maryland

MD970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970019 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970021 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970023 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970026 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970042 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970046 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970048 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970054 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970056 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970057 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 MD970058 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Pennsylvania

PA970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970013 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970016 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970017 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970020 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970032 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970038 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970041 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970042 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970051 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970053 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970062 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 PA970065 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Virginia

VA970015 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 VA970018 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 VA970034 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 VA970036 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 VA970039 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 VA970051 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume III

Alabama

AL970007 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 AL970008 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 AL970052 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume IV

Illinois

IL970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970005 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970006 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970008 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970009 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970010 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970011 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970012 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970013 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970014 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970015 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970023 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970026 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970039 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970047 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970049 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970053 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970055 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970059 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IL970065 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Indiana

IN970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970003 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970005 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970006 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970016 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970017 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970018 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970020 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970059 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IN970061 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume V

Arkansas

AR970008 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 AR970023 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 AR970027 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Iowa

IA970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 IA970005 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume VI

Colorado

CO970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970003 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970005 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970006 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970007 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970008 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970009 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970010 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970011 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970014 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970016 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970018 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970020 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970021 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970022 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970023 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970024 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CO970025 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Idaho

ID970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 ID970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Montana

MT970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)

North Dakota

ND970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Oregon

OR970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 OR970017 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Washington

WA970001 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970002 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970003 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970005 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970007 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970008 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970011 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WA970013 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Wyoming

WY970004 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WY970009 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 WY970021 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Volume VII

California

CA970029 (Feb. 14, 1997)
 CA970030 (Feb. 14, 1997)

Hawaii

HI9700001 (Feb. 14, 1997)

General Wage Determination Publication

General wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts, including those noted above, may be found in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled "General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis—Bacon and Related Acts". This publication is available at each of the 50 Regional Government Depository Libraries and many of the 1,400 Government Depository Libraries across the country.

The general wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts are available electronically by subscription to the FedWorld Bulletin Board System of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the U.S. Department of Commerce at (703) 487-4630.

Hard-copy subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, (202) 512-1800.

When ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the seven separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, D.C. This 30th Day of May 1997.

Carl J. Poleskey,

Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 97-14560 Filed 6-5-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-27-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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. Currently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed new "Research on the Feasibility of Collecting Occupational Wage Data by Union Status."

A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the addressee section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addressee section below on or before August 5, 1997.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the BLS, 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.

ADDRESSEE: Send comments to Karin G. Kurz, BLS Clearance Officer, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Room 3255, 2 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington D.C. 20212. Ms. Kurz can be reached on 202-606-7628 (this is not a toll free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Employment Standards Administration (ESA) has determined that research should be conducted into alternative ways of collecting information for Davis-Bacon Act purposes. As a result, ESA's Wage and Hour Division (WHD) wishes to evaluate the usefulness of BLS data in the Davis-Bacon wage determination process.

The Davis-Bacon Act

The Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a) requires that workers employed on Federal construction contracts valued in excess of \$2,000 be paid wages and fringe benefits that, at a minimum, have been determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing for corresponding classes of workers employed on projects similar in character to the contract work in the area where the construction takes place. The prevailing wage is defined by Department of Labor regulations as the wage paid to more than 50 percent of the workers in the job classification on similar projects in the area during the period in question. If the majority of those employed in the classification are not paid the same wage, the prevailing wage is determined by calculating the average of the wages paid. In cases where the majority of workers in a classification are represented by a union and are paid the same rate, the union rate is the prevailing rate.

Summary

Current Actions

BLS plans to determine the feasibility of using the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) survey to gather the union/nonunion status of employees in construction industries by detail occupation; the results will be evaluated by ESA to assess their usefulness for Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage determinations. Specifically the goal is to determine whether, in a mail survey where occupational employment and wage level information is being collected on every employee in an establishment, the respondent also has information on employees' union/nonunion status and would be willing to provide it. The process would consist of three components: a telephone "case study"; a survey form test; and a follow-up Response Analysis Survey (RAS).

The case study would be implemented in early Fiscal Year (FY) 1998 as part of the routine follow-up efforts after the most recent OES data collection cycle. After the initial mail-out of survey forms, OES staff in four states would contact firms by telephone in the construction industries (Standard Industrial Classifications 15, 16, and 17) that did not respond by mail to collect the OES data. After collecting the OES data, the questioner would ask if any of the workers in the establishment belonged to a union. If the response was "yes," the OES staff would proceed through the list of occupations reported by the employer to determine for each occupation whether workers belonged to a union.

The intent of this case study would be to gauge the operational feasibility of soliciting information from respondents on the union/nonunion status of their employees by occupation as part of the regular OES wage survey. This would allow BLS to ascertain whether employers can or will readily provide the union status data, what the relative proportion of respondents that have union workers might be, how soliciting this information would affect employer burden, and how disruptive this collection effort would be to the current OES collection process. This case study would not result in the production of estimates regarding the union/nonunion question.

The survey form test following the case study would take place in FY 1999 and would involve mailing questionnaires similar to the current OES survey form (instead of the regular form) to establishments in the construction industry. BLS would test alternative forms to determine which is able to gather the most accurate information while causing the least additional burden to respondents and having the least negative impact on response rates. The purpose of the survey form test would be to determine, first, whether respondents would be willing to provide information on union/nonunion status by occupation through a mail survey. The test also would determine, through the use of different formats, the one format that obtains the most accurate information with least added burden to respondents. Finally, the test would show what impact, if any, requesting this information on the OES survey form would have on OES response rates.

Depending upon response levels in the survey form test, it is possible that estimates of varying occupational detail could be produced.

The follow-up Response Analysis Survey (RAS) would consist of questions asked over the telephone of 2500 respondents, drawn from construction and non-construction industries. The questioner would ask respondents about the data they reported, what records were used to report the data, how long it took them to complete the survey, etc. One purpose of the RAS would be to gather, from respondents, an idea of the difference in burden placed on respondents between completing the regular OES wage survey form and the survey form containing the union/nonunion questions. The expected time needed to complete each RAS is 30 minutes.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) will use the information provided for

statistical purposes only. To the full extent permitted by law, BLS will hold the information in confidence and will

not disclose it without the written consent of respondents.

Type of Review: New Collection.

Agency: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Title: Research on the Feasibility of Collecting Occupational Wage Data by Union Status.

Activity form(s)	Total number of respondents	Affected public	Frequency	Total annual response	Average time per response	Est. total burden hours
Case Study	2,500	Business and other for profit	Once FY98 ..	1,725	10 minutes ...	288
Survey Form Test BLS-2877 715-EZ; BLS-2877 715 Test1; BLS-2877 715 Test2.	9,000	Business and other for profit	Once FY99 ..	7,000	1 hour	7,000
RAS BLS-2877 715-RAS	2,500	Business and other for profit; Not for profit inst.	Once FY98/ FY99.	2,250	30 minutes ...	1,125
Totals	14,000	10,975	8,413
Two year average	7,000	5,488	4,207

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

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): \$0.

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 ICR; they also will become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd day of June, 1997.

W. Stuart Rust, Jr.,

Acting Chief, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[FR Doc. 97-14816 Filed 6-5-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-24-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Supplement to California State Plan; Approval

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Approval; California State Standard on Hazard Communication Incorporating Proposition 65.

SUMMARY: This notice approves, subject to certain conditions, the California Hazard Communication Standard, including its incorporation of the occupational applications of the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (Proposition 65). Where a State standard adopted pursuant to an OSHA-approved State plan differs substantially from a comparable Federal standard, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the OSH Act) requires that the State standard be "at least as effective" in providing safe and healthful places of employment. In addition, if the standard is applicable to a product distributed or used in interstate commerce, it must be

required by compelling local conditions and not pose an undue burden on commerce.

After consideration of public comments and review of the record, OSHA is approving the California standard, with the following conditions, which are applicable to all enforcement actions brought under the authority of the State plan, whether by California agencies or private plaintiffs:

(1) Employers covered by Proposition 65 may comply with the occupational requirements of that law by complying with the OSHA or Cal/OSHA Hazard Communication provisions, as explicitly provided in the State's regulations.

(2) The designated State agency, Cal/OSHA, is responsible for assuring that enforcement of its general Hazard Communication Standard and Proposition 65 results in "at least as effective" worker protection; the agency must take appropriate action to assure that court decisions in supplemental enforcement actions do not result in a less effective standard or in inconsistencies with the conditions under which the standard is Federally approved.

(3) The State standard, including Proposition 65 in its occupational aspects, may not be enforced against out-of-state manufacturers because a State plan may not regulate conduct occurring outside the State.

These conditions are based on OSHA's understanding of the State's regulations and on general State plan law. Finally, Proposition 65 also is applicable to non-occupational (i.e. consumer and environmental) exposures. OSHA has no authority to address Proposition 65's non-occupational applications; consequently, they are not at issue in this decision and will be unaffected by it.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 6, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bonnie Friedman, Director, Office of Information and Consumer Affairs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-3647, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 219-8148.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Contents of OSHA'S Decision

- I. Background
 - A. Pertinent Legal Authority
 - B. Description of the California State Plan Supplement
 1. Federal and State Hazard Communication Standards
 2. Proposition 65
 3. OSHA Review and Public Comment
- II. Summary and Explanation of Legal Issues
 - A. Applicability of Product Clause to Proposition 65 Requirements
 - B. Overview: OSHA Review of State Standards Under the Product Clause
 - C. Burden of Proof
 - D. Application of the California Standard to Out-of-State Manufacturers and Distributors
 - E. Designated State Agency
 - F. Exemption for Public Sector Employers
- III. Summary and Explanation of Remaining Issues Under Section 18
 - A. Compelling Local Conditions
 1. Overview
 2. Commentor Rebuttal Arguments
 - B. Remaining 18(c)(2) Issues
 1. Overview
 2. Businesses Can Comply With Proposition 65 by Using Methods Prescribed by the Federal Hazard Communication Standard
 3. Comparison of Coverage Under Federal Standard and Proposition 65
 - Overview
 - Mixtures
 - Articles
 - Pesticides
 - Aflatoxins
 - California Non-Chemical Manufacturers
 4. Substantive Differences Between the Federal and General California Standards
 - Trade Secrets
 - California's Omission of Federal Exemptions and Exclusions