Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response	Burden (hours)
77.1909–1 Permit Appl	5	On Occasion	5	1 hour	5
Totals			190		110

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

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): $755.

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, 1998.

George M. Fesak,

Director, Program Evaluation and Information Resources.

[FR Doc. 98–11109 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–47–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Hazardous Condition Complaints

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 Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to the submission of hazardous conditions complaints addressed in 30 CFR 43.2, 43.4, 43.7, and 43.8. 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 can be obtained by contacting the employee listed below in the For Further Information Contact section of this notice.

DATES: Submit comments on or before June 26, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Patricia W. Silvey, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Room 627, Arlington, VA 22203–1984. Commenters are encouraged to send their comments on a computer disk, or via E-mail to psilvey@msha.gov, along with an original printed copy. Ms. Silvey can be reached at (703) 235–1910 (voice) or (703) 235–5551 (facsimile).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George M. Fesak, Director, Office of Program Evaluation and Information Resources, U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Room 715, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203–1984. Mr. Fesak can be reached at gfesak@msha.gov (Internet E-mail), (703) 235–8378 (voice), or (703) 235–1563 (facsimile).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Under Section 103(g) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (Mine Act), 30 U.S.C. 813(g), a representative of miners or any individual miner may submit a written notice of an alleged violation of the Mine Act or mandatory health or safety standard or an imminent danger situation. Such notification requires MSHA to make an immediate inspection. A copy of the notice must be provided to the operator.

Title 30, CFR part 43 implements Section 103(g) of the Mine Act. The regulations outline the procedures for submitting notification of the alleged violation and the actions which MSHA must take after receiving the notice. If MSHA determines that a special inspection is not warranted, a written notice of negative finding shall be issued as soon as possible following the determination. A miner or a representative of miners has the option of requesting in writing an information review of MSHA's decision that no inspection is warranted or in those instances where an MSHA inspector has refused to issue a citation or order with regard to the violation alleged to have existed by the miner.

II. Current Actions

MSHA is required to conduct inspections whenever and however complaints of hazardous conditions are made to the Agency by miners or representatives of miners. This is an Agency responsibility mandated by the provisions of Section 103(g) of the Act and implemented through the provisions of 30 C.F.R. Part 43. MSHA has minimized the paper work burden by providing alternative toll free telephone extensions for verbal and anonymous complaints and providing for the reduction of such complaints to written format by agency personnel. MSHA's effectiveness in enforcing the mandatory safety and health standards is dependent in part on its ability to provide a timely response to hazardous condition complaints in order to retain the confidence of miners and to encourage compliance with health and safety standards between the mandated, periodic inspection events at underground and surface mines and mine facilities.

Type of Review: Revision (with changes to include § 43.2 and 43.8).

Agency: Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Hazardous Conditions Compliants—30 CFR § 43.2, 43.4, 43.7, and 43.8.

OMB Number: 1219–0014.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit institutions.

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response (hours)	Burden (hours)
43.2 General	272 verbal 350 written 622 total	On occasion	622	.2	124
43.4 Giving notice	All burden included under 43.2				
43.7 Informal review	15	On occasion	15	.2	3
43.8 Informal review	All burden included under 43.7				
Totals	637	On occasion	637	.2	127

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

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): $8.

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 21, 1998.

George M. Fesak,

Director, Program Evaluation and Information Resources.

[FR Doc. 98–11110 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–43–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. NRTL–2–97]

Detroit Testing Laboratory, Inc., Recognition as an NRTL

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration; Labor.

ACTION: Notice of recognition as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL).

SUMMARY: This notice announces the Agency's final decision on the application of Detroit Testing Laboratory, Inc. for recognition as an NRTL under 29 CFR 1910.7.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This recognition will become effective on April 27, 1998 and will be valid for a period of five years from that date, until April 28, 2003, unless terminated prior to that date, in accordance with 29 CFR 1910.7.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernard Pasquet, Office of Technical Programs and Coordination Activities, NRTL Program, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room N3653, Washington, D.C. 20210, or phone (202) 219–7056.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Notice of Final Decision

Notice is hereby given that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has recognized Detroit Testing Laboratory, Inc. (DTL) as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory for the equipment or materials listed below. DTL applied for recognition as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory, pursuant to 29 CFR 1910.7, and a notice of the application was published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 62358, 11/21/97). The notice included a preliminary finding that DTL could meet the requirements for recognition detailed in 29 CFR 1910.7, and invited public comment on the application by January 20, 1998. No comments were received concerning this request for recognition.

Copies of all application documents (Docket No. NRTL–2–97) are available for inspection and duplication at the Docket Office, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room N2634, Washington, D.C. 20210.

The address of the laboratory covered by this application is: Detroit Testing Laboratory, Inc., 7111 E. Eleven Mile, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Background

Detroit Testing Laboratory, Inc. (DTL), according to the applicant, is a Michigan corporation and was formally incorporated in 1949. The applicant states that the lab was originally founded in 1903 as a partnership, that ownership of the lab changed in 1948 and again in 1968, and that in 1976, the current owner purchased DTL as sole stockholder.

The applicant submitted an application package, and separately submitted a Quality Assurance (QA) Manual (see Exhibits 2A and 2B). The QA Manual includes: An organization chart, position descriptions, and résumés of key personnel; department descriptions including equipment and standards used for departments involved in testing; description of certifications done and standards used for certification; and the details on how calibrations are handled, including descriptions of equipment and standards.

The four primary criteria for recognition are presented below, along with examples which illustrate how DTL has met these criteria.

Capability

Section 1910.7(b)(1) states that for each specified item of equipment or material to be listed, labeled or accepted, the laboratory must have the capability (including proper testing equipment and facilities, trained staff, written testing procedures, and calibration and quality control programs) to perform appropriate testing. The application and on-site review report indicate that DTL meets these criteria.

The applicant has one main facility at its site in Warren, Michigan, and a smaller test facility in Center Line, Michigan. This smaller site is not included in the applicant's request for recognition. The applicant has natural gas, electric, compressed air, steam, and water available in the laboratory for product testing and for calibrations and tests.

The applicant's QA Manual shows the testing experience of its key testing staff, mentions its certification, and listing and labeling experience with products, and describes its testing capabilities and experience in a number of specific areas. It also contains a list of major instrumentation and equipment.

Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures, Test/Operating procedures (developed on a form, the original of which is kept by each lab), calibration procedures, and audits (including proficiency audits which depends in part on the use of outside private services) are described in the QA Manual. Furthermore, the QA includes an Internal Corrective Action Procedure whereby reports are issued to an area when it operates outside the guidelines of the QA System. The QA Manual also contains a sample handling procedure and procedures on employee training. Written procedures exist for typical tests, per QA Manual.