

Note on Notation Items 199 – 203:

The recommendation status changes originally slated to be considered through Notation Items 199 – 203 were instead discussed and voted upon at a public meeting on July 31, 2002. No notation items were actually circulated. The attached meeting transcript (including a copy of the Federal Register notice for the meeting) documents the disposition of these matters.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**Forest Service****Del Norte County Resource Advisory Committee**

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Del Norte County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will meet on August 6, 2002 in Crescent City, California. The purpose of the meeting is to select Title II projects under Public Law 106-393, H.R. 2389, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, also called the "Payments to States" Act.

DATES: The meeting will be held on August 6, 2002 from 6 to 8:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Elk Valley Rancheria Community Center, 2298 Norris Avenue, Suite B, Crescent City, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Laura Chapman, Committee Coordinator, USDA, Six Rivers National Forest, 1330 Bayshore Way, Eureka, CA 95501. Phone: (707) 441-3549. E-mail: ljchapman@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This will be the tenth meeting of the committee and will focus on selecting Title II projects. The meeting is open to the public. Public input opportunity will be provided and individuals will have the opportunity to address the committee at that time.

Dated: July 10, 2002.

S.E. 'Lou' Woltering,
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 02-18029 Filed 7-16-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD**Sunshine Act Meeting**

The U. S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board announces that it will convene a Public Meeting beginning at 10 a.m. local time on July 31, 2002, at 2175 K Street, NW., Suite 400 Conference Room, Washington DC. The Board will discuss and deliberate on staff recommendations regarding an update to the CSB strategic plan for FY 2003. The Board will also consider the status of recommendations from prior CSB investigations and the responses from recipients of those recommendations. Additionally, the CSB staff will present to the Board an update on the Reactive Chemical

Hazards Investigation and the close of the public comment period following the public hearing held in Paterson, New Jersey, on May 30, 2002.

CSB investigators will also update the Board on the status of current CSB investigative efforts. The meeting will conclude with an update on current administrative and contracting matters and the resolution of on-going audit issues.

All staff presentations are preliminary and are intended solely to allow the Board to consider in a public forum the relevant issues and factors. No factual analyses, conclusions, or findings should be considered final.

The meeting is open to the public. Please notify CSB if a translator or interpreter is needed, 10 business days prior to the public meeting. For more information, please contact the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board at (202)-261-7600, or visit our website at: www.csb.gov.

Christopher W. Warner,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 02-18172 Filed 7-15-02; 2:04 pm]

BILLING CODE 6350-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-580-813]

Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review; Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Korea

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from TK Corporation, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Korea. This new shipper review covers imports of subject merchandise from TK Corporation. The period of review is February 1, 2001 through July 31, 2001.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 17, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker, Mike Heaney, or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-2924, (202) 482-4475, or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Applicable statute and regulations:**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1, 2001).

Background

On February 23, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Korea. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Korea*, 58 FR 11029 (February 23, 1993). On August 31, 2001, TK Corporation, a producer and exporter of the subject merchandise during the period of review (POR), requested that the Department conduct an antidumping duty new shipper review of the antidumping duty order. TK Corporation certified it did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of the investigation (POI) (December 1, 1991 through May 30, 1992), and that it was not affiliated with any exporter or producer of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. TK Corporation also submitted documentation establishing the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise for export to the United States, the volume shipped, and the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. On October 5, 2001, the Department initiated a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Korea. *See Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Korea: Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review*, 66 FR 51017 (October 5, 2001).

On October 12, 2001, the Department issued its antidumping duty questionnaire. On November 9, 2001, the Department received TK Corporation's Section A response to the questionnaire; TK Corporation filed its Sections B and C responses on November 30, 2001. On January 22, 2002, the Department issued a Sections A-C supplemental questionnaire, to which TK Corporation responded on February 6, 2002.

On April 3, 2002 the Department extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results. *See Notice of Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

+ + + + +

Wednesday,

July 31, 2002

+ + + + +

The Board met in Room 400, 2175 K Street,
N.W., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Dr. Gerald
Poje, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

DR. GERALD POJE

DR. ANDREA KIDD TAYLOR

DR. ISADORE ROSENTHAL

CHRISTOPHER WARNER, General Counsel

CHARLES JEFFRESS, CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Welcome and Introductions..... 3

Opening statements by Board Members..... 10

Opening statement - Chief Operating Officer..... 9

Investigations and Safety Program Update
 William Hoyle
 Director
 Office of Investigation and Safety
 Programs..... 10

Discussion on staff evaluation of
 recipient recommendations
 Don Holmstrom, Senior Investigator..... 11

Update on Motiva Enterprises
 Kevin Mitchell, Investigator..... 22

Update on Kaltech Industries
 Kevin Mitchell, Investigator..... 25

Update on reactive chemical hazard
 investigation
 John Murphy, Senior Investigator..... 29

Update on Georgia Pacific Corporation
 Lisa Long, Lead Investigator..... 30

Chief Operating Officer Updates
 Charles Jeffress, COO

Update on Strategic Plan for
 FY 2003..... 31

Updates on administrative,
 contracting and audit issues..... 48

Other Business
 Next Board meeting..... 54

Public Comment..... 55

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 MR. JEFFRESS: Thank you.

3 DR. POJE: With that, I'd like to just
4 briefly review today's agenda. Our two major purposes
5 today, one is to review the status of activities in
6 our Investigations and Safety Programs area, and one
7 very major portion of that will be focusing in on
8 staff recommendations to the Board for declaring the
9 status of ongoing recommendations to the industry that
10 grows out of our investigative work. The second will
11 be a report from Charles about the strategic planning
12 for the Agency, particularly for Fiscal Year 2003.

13 So, with that, I'd like to introduce Bill
14 Hoyle, Director of Investigations and Safety Programs
15 area. Bill?

16 MR. HOYLE: Thank you, Dr. Poje. Good
17 morning, everyone. We have five presentations by the
18 Office of Investigations and Safety Programs this
19 morning. A number of them will be brief, but I want
20 to lead with Don Holmstrom, who is our senior person
21 in our recommendations work, who will talk about, as
22 Dr. Poje explained, developments in our
23 recommendations work since our last public meeting.
24 Then we will have four updates on investigations that
25 we're currently conducting.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First, we will have Kevin Mitchell, one of
2 our Investigators, who will talk about our
3 investigation at Motiva Enterprises in Delaware, and
4 then Kevin will also talk about our investigation in
5 New York City of Kaltech Industries. Then we will
6 have John Murphy, the lead Investigator for reactivities
7 hazards investigation. And then, lastly, we'll have
8 Lisa Long, who is our lead Investigator on the Georgia
9 Pacific investigation of an incident that took place
10 in Alabama.

11 So, without further delay, I'll bring Don
12 Holmstrom up to talk about our recommendations work.

13 MR. HOLMSTROM: Thank you. Good morning
14 to the Board. Thank you, Bill.

15 (Slide)

16 My name is Don Holmstrom. I'm going to
17 talk today about recommendations status. The
18 Recommendations Program of the CSB not only
19 participates in the development of recommendations,
20 but just as importantly advocates for tracks and helps
21 ensure the completion of the recommendations that are
22 issued by the Board.

23 The recommendations of the Chemical Safety
24 Board are issued and closed only by a vote of the
25 Board Members. Safety recommendations are the primary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tool used by the Board to motivate implementation of
2 safety improvements to prevent future incidents.

3 We use our unique independent accident
4 investigation perspective to identify trends or issues
5 that might otherwise be overlooked. CSB
6 recommendations may be directed to corporations, trade
7 unions, trade associations, safety organizations, and
8 other entities, for recommendations begin the process
9 that eventually saves lives and protects the
10 environment.

11 (Slide)

12 At today's meeting, CSB staff will present
13 the Board proposed status assignments for
14 recommendations from several completed CSB
15 investigations. The assignments include categories
16 that specify whether or not the recommendation was
17 successfully adopted, and if it is open or closed.
18 The Board will carefully consider the staff proposals
19 and take appropriate action.

20 (Slide)

21 We also have a summary of recommendations
22 activity to date. Currently, we have 81
23 recommendations have been issued by the Chemical
24 Safety Board. We have 33 recommendations that have
25 been closed by the Board to date, and today we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposing status designations for six recommendations,
2 and the status categories that we are recommending or
3 proposing today are six for "Closed-Acceptable
4 Action".

5 (Slide)

6 The first incident and recommendation I'm
7 going to talk about today arose out of the Union
8 Carbide incident that occurred in Hahnville, Louisiana
9 in March of 1998. In the Union Carbide incident, one
10 worker was killed and another was seriously injured
11 due to a nitrogen asphyxiation in a temporary
12 enclosure that was formed by placement of a sheet of
13 plastic over an open end of a 48-inch pipe.

14 At the time of the incident, the workers
15 were performing an inspection inside the pipe. The
16 report found there were no warning signs that were
17 placed near the pipe entrance identifying it as a
18 possible confined space, or warning that the
19 atmosphere inside the pipe could contain a potentially
20 hazardous atmosphere.

21 The CSB found that the open pipe incident
22 might not have been easily identified as meeting the
23 OSHA definition of a confined space because the means
24 of exit, in this case through a plastic sheet, may not
25 have been perceived as being restricted or limited,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which is an OSHA regulatory requirement. However, the
2 report concluded that if Union Carbide had used permit
3 required confined space entry procedures for this
4 temporary enclosure, the incident would likely have
5 been prevented.

6 The CSB issued a recommendation to Union
7 Carbide to issue a safety alert that addresses the
8 hazards and provides safety guidelines for the use of
9 temporary enclosures that are erected around equipment
10 containing hazardous substances.

11 DR. TAYLOR: Don, that was a
12 recommendation to OSHA instead of Union Carbide.

13 MR. HOLMSTROM: Yes -- I'm sorry -- to
14 OSHA. I apologize. The CSB found that temporary
15 enclosures might not fit the OSHA definition of a
16 confined space, or be perceived as falling under those
17 requirements. Consequently, the CSB made this
18 recommendation to OSHA.

19 OSHA produced a Technical Information
20 Bulletin entitled "Exposures to Hazards Associated
21 With Temporary Enclosures". In the bulletin, OSHA
22 addresses a number of types of hazards that may be
23 present in temporary enclosures and confined spaces,
24 with an emphasis on hazardous atmospheres, including
25 oxygen-deficient atmospheres. The bulletin also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 addresses the hazards of nitrogen as an asphyxiant in
2 a temporary enclosure and confined space.

3 (Slide)

4 Where temporary enclosures do not meet the
5 regulatory definition of a confined space, OSHA
6 recommends that the confined space requirements be
7 followed to the extent possible. OSHA states that the
8 bulletin has been widely disseminated to OSHA's
9 Regional Offices, State designees, consultation
10 programs managers, and posted on OSHA's Website along
11 with a PowerPoint presentation of the bulletin.

12 OSHA issues the Technical Information
13 Bulletins to provide information about occupational
14 hazards or to address noteworthy procedures, practices
15 and research. OSHA emphasizes that the Technical
16 Information Bulletins are not standards or
17 regulations, and do not create any legal obligations.

18 The staff proposes that the recommendation
19 be assigned the status of "Closed-Acceptable Action".

20 Does the Board have any questions
21 concerning this proposal?

22 DR. TAYLOR: I don't.

23 DR. POJE: No. Irv?

24 DR. ROSENTHAL: No.

25 DR. POJE: I just want to make the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 observation that I think while it's not a regulatory
2 requirement, it still is on the pathway towards
3 advocating prevention, and I think this is a
4 significant step to enable those who might access such
5 information to better protect the workforce that's in
6 their facilities. I do support the recommendation.

7 One of my suggestions is I would like to
8 vote on all of these matters today, here in public,
9 but vote on them en bloc so that we'll hear all of
10 them first and, with your agreement, I suggest that
11 Don proceed with the other four items and we'll take a
12 vote after that.

13 Should we act, as I anticipate we will
14 today, Don, I also would want you and Charles to
15 consider us making available through our Website the
16 same information so that those who might be following
17 the Web for chemical safety through the Chemical
18 Safety Board might also avail themselves of the same
19 information that's now located on the Website and
20 OSHA. So, please consider that as well.

21 MR. HOLMSTROM: Okay. Thank you.

22 (Slide)

23 The next recommendation is to the American
24 Petroleum Institute. There were two recommendations
25 that were the same out of the Sonat and Tosco reports

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that API communicate the findings of the Sonat and
2 Tosco reports to their membership.

3 (Slide)

4 API noted that they communicated the final
5 report through a number of channels, including their
6 Website, their Environmental Health and Safety
7 Newsletter, at public meetings, and at API committee
8 meetings.

9 The staff proposes this recommendation be
10 assigned a status of "Closed-Acceptable Action".

11 DR. ROSENTHAL: Do they actually have the
12 report on their Website, Don?

13 MR. HOLMSTROM: No, they don't have the
14 report on their Website. They have communicated the
15 existence of the report on their Website.

16 DR. ROSENTHAL: Okay.

17 MR. HOLMSTROM: And we have a
18 communication from them detailing the items -- the
19 actions they have taken.

20 DR. ROSENTHAL: Well, it might be useful -
21 - of course, the whole report is rather lengthy -- to
22 consider at least having the Findings and
23 Recommendations posted. I think the members would
24 find that useful.

25 MR. HOLMSTROM: Thank you. Any other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments or questions?

2 (No response.)

3 (Slide)

4 The next recommendation status is the
5 Paper, Allied-Industrial and Energy Workers
6 International Union, PACE. The Chemical Safety Board
7 made a recommendation out of the Morton and Tosco
8 reports for PACE to communicate the findings of this
9 report to your membership. PACE noted in their
10 recommendations response letter that they had
11 communicated the final report from both incidents
12 through a number of channels, including Joint Health
13 and Safety Committee and Education Committee. A
14 detailed synopsis of both incidents appeared in the
15 editions of the PACEsetter. Their response also
16 indicated they are using the reports as educational
17 material in PACE training.

18 The staff proposes a recommendation be
19 assigned the status of "Closed-Acceptable Action".

20 DR. POJE: Here, again, I would just make
21 the observation that I think it's important from the
22 Board's vantage point that all parties who can
23 potentially enhance prevention should be appealed to
24 for getting the information out. I'm happy to see
25 that the PACE Union has tackled this and that you are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 considering that to be an acceptable set of actions.

2 Our hope, though, is that the
3 circumstances that surrounded both of these incidents,
4 while occurring at a particular day and a particular
5 time, still have meaning to people far beyond the
6 completion of our investigative and recommendation
7 work. So, I would just urge us, in our continued
8 communications with the PACE Union, that the one-time
9 communication of the findings from this and the
10 lessons learned from these incidents might prove
11 beneficial in an ongoing way to their staff, and may
12 need to be revisited in the future so that it is not
13 just a one-time-only look at this and absorb it. New
14 members will be coming in, people who may not have
15 received that earlier communication, and we want them
16 to be benefitted in a preventative way from the same
17 information.

18 DR. TAYLOR: One example could be, you
19 know, to use this as an ongoing health and safety
20 training tool case study learning, something along
21 that line.

22 MR. HOLMSTROM: They indicated in their
23 response letter that both reports are being
24 incorporated into their training material and will be
25 utilized for future training both amongst the rank-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and-file as well as joint health and safety
2 committees.

3 DR. POJE: Thank you.

4 (Slide)

5 MR. HOLMSTROM: CSB made a recommendation
6 to the National Petrochemical and Refiners
7 Association, NPRA, from the TOSCO reports to
8 communicate the findings of that report to their
9 membership.

10 (Slide)

11 The NPRA noted that they communicated the
12 report at a meeting of their Fire and Accident
13 Prevention Committee, which is responsible for the
14 annual NPRA National Safety Conference. The report
15 was communicated as part of the Best Practices/Lessons
16 Learned session of the conference.

17 The staff proposes this recommendation be
18 assigned the status of "Closed-Acceptable Action".

19 Any comments or questions?

20 DR. POJE: Thank you.

21 (Slide)

22 MR. HOLMSTROM: The highlights today are
23 six recommendations are proposed to be closed out
24 successfully, and I think the big highlight of today's
25 recommendations status report is that OSHA -- the CSB

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recommendation went to OSHA issuing a Technical
2 Information Bulletin that covers temporary enclosures,
3 which is a topic, a significant topic, that has not
4 been addressed previously by existing OSHA guidance.

5 DR. POJE: Thank you, Don. Are there any
6 other questions from the Board Members?

7 (No response.)

8 Then I would like to move that we accept
9 the recommendation from the staff to apply the status
10 for these six recommendations as "Closed-Acceptable".

11 DR. TAYLOR: Second.

12 DR. POJE: All in favor, say "aye".

13 (Ayes.)

14 DR. POJE: Okay. Thank you. I would like
15 to make just one follow-up comment to those
16 recommendations. Don, it is obvious that we will
17 continue to be pursuing "communicate this to your
18 membership" type recommendation. I think we are
19 gaining now significant experience that expresses the
20 range of options that people might employ, some of
21 them, I think, as Andrea raised, leading to embedding
22 them in an ongoing training program. have a much
23 deeper value, I believe, to those organizations, and
24 some of them communicating one time at an annual
25 meeting, would have value but of a lesser, more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701