

§ 50.11 Investigation.

(a) After notification of an accident by an operator, the MSHA District Manager will promptly decide whether to conduct an accident investigation and will promptly inform the operator of his decision. If MSHA decides to investigate an accident, it will initiate the investigation within 24 hours of notification.

(b) Each operator of a mine shall investigate each accident and each occupational injury at the mine. Each operator of a mine shall develop a report of each investigation. No operator may use Form 7000-1 as a report, except that an operator of a mine at which fewer than twenty miners are employed may, with respect to that mine, use Form 7000-1 as an investigation report respecting an occupational injury not related to an accident. No operator may use an investigation or an investigation report conducted or prepared by MSHA to comply with this paragraph. An operator shall submit a copy of any investigation report to MSHA at its request. Each report prepared by the operator shall include,

- (1) The date and hour of occurrence;
- (2) The date the investigation began;
- (3) The names of individuals participating in the investigation;
- (4) A description of the site;
- (5) An explanation of the accident or injury, including a description of any equipment involved and relevant events before and after the occurrence, and any explanation of the cause of any injury, the cause of any accident or cause of any other event which caused an injury;
- (6) The name, occupation, and experience of any miner involved;
- (7) A sketch, where pertinent, including dimensions depicting the occurrence;
- (8) A description of steps taken to prevent a similar occurrence in the future; and
- (9) Identification of any report submitted under § 50.20 of this part.

D2. What type of alcohol and other drug use inquiries should be made after accidents (*e.g.*, questioning, drug testing)?

D3. What degree of accident or injury should trigger an inquiry (all, fatal, lost-time, others)?

D4. How should the information collected in the inquiry be used, and by whom?

D5. What actions should be required if it is determined that the use of alcohol or other drugs was a contributing factor or cause of the accident?

E. Drug-Free Workplace Programs

Although our regulations currently do not require programs to address the safety hazards that the presence of alcohol and other drugs in the workplace may cause, some mine operators have voluntarily put these programs in place. Typically, such a program, often called a drug-free workplace program, includes at least one of the following five components:

drug-free workplace policy; employee education; supervisory training; drug testing; and an employee assistance program. Please provide examples and data to support your answers to the following questions:

E1. Do you have a drug-free workplace program at your mine, or have you instituted any of the above mentioned components, even if not referred to as a drug-free workplace? Please provide a copy of your program policy and procedures. Is this program part of a broader program?

E2. If you have a drug-free workplace policy or program:

E2-a. What prompted you to initiate your program?

E2-b. What components does your program have?

E2-c. Which of your program's components do you feel are most critical and/or effective, and why?

E2-d. Have you been able to document any improvement as a result of your program?

E2-e. Please provide any data that demonstrate the extent of the problem at your mine and the effectiveness of your program in improving safety at your mine.

E2-f. What issues/problems have you encountered in implementing your program and how have you resolved them?

E2-g. What actions are taken for miners who violate the terms of the policy?

E3. If you previously had a drug-free workplace program, what did it include? Why was it discontinued?

E4. If you conduct supervisory training on drug issues, how are supervisors taught to recognize and handle employees who may have alcohol and/or other drug problems? Please elaborate on how supervisors make these determinations.

E5. Do you have an employee assistance program, and if so, how many employees have accessed the EAP for problems related to alcohol and drug use? How many of these employees have had their problems resolved successfully?

F. Costs and Benefits

We are particularly interested in the costs and benefits you have experienced in planning and implementing a drug-free workplace program. In addition, we are interested in knowing what you estimate the costs to be of designing and implementing other elements of a drug-free workplace program. Please provide examples and data to support your answers to the following questions:

F1. What costs have you incurred from your efforts to reduce or eliminate

drugs or alcohol from the workplace? Please provide the costs by type (*e.g.*, personnel, training, equipment).

F2-a. What costs would be associated with having a drug-free workplace program (*e.g.*, program implementation, training, drug testing, EAP, restricted work programs, personnel effects)?

F2-b. Would these costs be borne disproportionately by small mines? If so, please explain how and by how much the costs would vary.

F3. What benefits have you derived from your efforts to reduce or eliminate alcohol or drugs from the workplace (*e.g.*, lower workers compensation costs, reduced absenteeism, employee morale, reduction in turnover, accident and injury reduction and related cost savings)?

Dated: September 29, 2005.

David G. Dye,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 05-19846 Filed 9-29-05; 3:11 pm]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
40 CFR Part 62

[R06-OAR-2004-NM-0002; FRL-7979-4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Bernalillo County, NM; Negative Declaration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving three negative declarations submitted by the City of Albuquerque (Bernalillo County) certifying that there are no existing sources subject to the requirements of sections 111(d) and 129 of the Clean Air Act under their jurisdiction. These three negative declarations are for Sulfuric Acid Mist Emissions from Sulfuric Acid Plants, Fluoride Emissions from Phosphate Fertilizer Plants, and Total Reduced Sulfur Emissions from Kraft Pulp Mills. This is a direct final rule action without prior notice and comment because this action is deemed noncontroversial.

DATES: Written comments must be received by November 3, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, by facsimile, or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions provided under the "Public Participation" heading in the Supplemental Information section of

direct final rule located in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kenneth W. Boyce, Air Planning Section, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2833, at (214) 665–7259 or boyce.kenneth@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving negative declarations submitted by the City of Albuquerque Environmental Health Department certifying that there are no existing sulfuric acid mist emissions from sulfuric acid plants, no existing fluoride emissions from phosphate fertilizer plants and no existing total reduced sulfur emissions from kraft pulp mills, under its jurisdiction in the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico (excluding tribal lands). These negative declarations meet the requirements of 40 CFR 62.06. EPA is approving sections 111(d)/129 State Plans as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. The EPA has explained its reasons for this approval in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no relevant adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent direct final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule located in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: September 19, 2005.

Lawrence E. Starfield,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.
[FR Doc. 05–19877 Filed 10–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[R06–OAR–2005–OK–0004; FRL–7979–6]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Oklahoma; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve the “State Plan” submitted by the state of Oklahoma on June 29, 2005, to fulfill the requirement of sections 111(d)/129 of the Clean Air Act for commercial and industrial solid waste incineration (CISWI) units. Specifically, the State Plan that EPA is proposing to approve, establishes emission limits for organics, carbon monoxide, metals, acid gases and particulate matter and compliance schedules for the existing CISWI units located in Oklahoma which will reduce the designated pollutants. The State Plan establishes monitoring, operating, and recordkeeping requirements for commercial and industrial solid waste incinerator (CISWI) units for which construction commenced on or before November 30, 1999. In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving Oklahoma’s State Plan submittal, as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received by November 3, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Mr. Thomas Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, by facsimile, or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions

provided under the “Public Participation” heading in the Supplemental Information section of direct final rule located in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kenneth W. Boyce, Air Planning Section, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2833, at (214) 665–7259 or boyce.kenneth@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving Oklahoma’s sections 111(d)/129 State Plan as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comment. The EPA has explained its reasons for this approval in the preamble to the direct final rule. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this action rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives no relevant adverse comment, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule located in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: September 19, 2005.

Lawrence E. Starfield,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.
[FR Doc. 05–19837 Filed 10–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P