

Therefore, each grantee must submit a quarterly report, as HUD prescribes, no later than 30 days following each calendar quarter, beginning after the first full calendar quarter after grant award and continuing until all funds have been expended and that expenditure reported. Each quarterly report will include information on the project name, activity, location, national objective, funds budgeted and expended, non-HUD Disaster Recovery Initiative Federal source and funds, numbers of properties and housing units, and numbers of low- and moderate-income households. Annually (i.e., with every fourth submission), the report shall include a financial reconciliation of funds budgeted and expended, and calculation of the overall percent of benefit to low- and moderate-income persons (unless waived). HUD is seeking approval from OMB for any new information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520).

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: June 19, 1998.

**Saul Ramirez,**

*Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.*

[FR Doc. 98-17273 Filed 6-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-29-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Labor

#### 29 CFR Parts 1915 and 1926

RIN 1218-AB25

#### Occupational Exposure to Asbestos

**AGENCY:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document revises the Construction and Shipyard standards regulating occupational exposure to asbestos to conform the standards to the Court of Appeals decision in *Asbestos Information Association/North America v. Reich*, 117 F. 3d 891 (5th Cir. July 24, 1997). The Court vacated the construction and shipyard standards insofar as they regulate asbestos-containing roof cements, mastics and coatings. The court's decision did not affect the general industry asbestos standard, and that standard is not being changed.

**DATES:** Effective on July 24, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Martonik, Acting Director, Directorate of

Safety Standards Programs, Room N-3605, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Telephone (202) 219-8061.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 10, 1994, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration published final standards (59 FR 40964, 29 CFR 1910.1001, 1915.1001, and 1926.1101), regarding occupational asbestos exposure. On June 29, 1995, OSHA issued amendments (60 FR 33974, 29 CFR 1915.1001 and 1926.1101) to correct and clarify various provisions of the construction and shipyard employment standards.

The Asbestos Information Association/North American (AIA/NA) petitioned for review of the construction and maritime standards' requirements for work practices, training, and hazard communication for asphalt roof cements, coatings and mastics which contain asbestos. In *Asbestos Information Association/North America v. Reich*, 117 F. 3d 891 (5th Cir. July 24, 1997), the court vacated the standards insofar as they regulate these materials.

##### Need for Correction

OSHA is amending sections 1915.1001 and 1926.1101 to conform the regulations to the court's decision. OSHA is adding a statement to paragraph (a) in both standards to state that the standard does not apply to asbestos-containing asphalt roof cements, coatings and mastics. In paragraph (g)(12) in the maritime standard and in paragraph (g)(11) of the construction standard covering alternative work practices, OSHA is deleting references to roofing cements, mastics and coatings. Section 1910.1001 remains unchanged.

OSHA is required to make these corrections to conform the standard to the court's decision. Because OSHA has no discretion in the matter, notice and opportunity for public comment are not necessary.

##### List of Subjects

###### 29 CFR Part 1915

Asbestos, Hazardous substances, Longshore and harbor workers, Occupational safety and health, Vessels.

###### 29 CFR Part 1926

Asbestos, Construction industry, Hazardous substances, Occupational safety and health.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 22nd day of June, 1998.

**Charles N. Jeffress,**

*Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.*

Accordingly, 29 CFR Parts 1915 and 1926 are corrected by making the following correcting amendments:

#### PART 1915—OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS FOR SHIPYARD EMPLOYMENT

1. The authority citation for 29 CFR part 1915 is revised to read as follows:

**Authority:** Sec. 41, Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 941); secs. 4, 6, 8, Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657); Secretary of Labor's Order No. 12-71 (36 FR 8754), 8-76 (41 FR 25059), 9-83 (48 FR 35736), 1-90 (55 FR 9033), or 6-96 (62 FR 111), as applicable; 29 CFR part 1911.

Section 1915.100 also issued under Section 29, Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 (49 U.S.C. 1801-1819) and 5 U.S.C. 553.

#### Subpart Z—Toxic and Hazardous Substances

2. In § 1915.1001, add paragraph (a)(8) and revise paragraph (g)(12) introductory text to read as follows:

##### § 1915.1001 Asbestos.

(a) *Scope and application.* \* \* \*

(8) This section does not apply to asbestos-containing asphalt roof cements, coatings and mastics.

(g) *Methods of compliance* \* \* \*

(12) *Alternative methods of compliance for installation, removal, repair, and maintenance of certain roofing and pipeline coating materials.* Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an employer who complies with all provisions of this paragraph (g)(12) when installing, removing, repairing, or maintaining intact pipeline asphaltic wrap, or roof flashings which contain asbestos fibers encapsulated or coated by bituminous or resinous compounds shall be deemed to be in compliance with this section. If an employer does not comply with all provisions of this paragraph (g)(12) or if during the course of the job the material does not remain intact, the provisions of paragraph (g)(8) of this section apply instead of this paragraph (g)(12).

\* \* \* \* \*

**PART 1926—SAFETY AND HEALTH REGULATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION**

**Subpart Z—Toxic and Hazardous Substances**

3. The authority citation for Subpart Z of 29 CFR 1926 is revised to read as follows:

**Authority:** Sec. 107, Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. 333); Secs. 4, 6, 8, Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657); Secretary of Labor's Order Nos. 12-71 (36 FR 8754), 8-76 (41 FR 25059), 9-83 (48 FR 35736), 1-90 (55 FR 9033), or 6-96 (62 FR 111), as applicable; 29 CFR part 1911.

Section 1926.1102 not issued under 29 U.S.C. 655 or 29 CFR part 1911; also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553.

4. In § 1926.1101, add paragraph (a)(8) and revise paragraph (g)(11) introductory text to read as follows:

**§ 1926.1101 Asbestos.**

(a) *Scope and application.* \* \* \*

(8) This section does not apply to asbestos-containing asphalt roof coatings, cements and mastics.

(g) *Methods of compliance* \* \* \*

(11) *Alternative methods of compliance for installation, removal, repair, and maintenance of certain roofing and pipeline coating materials.* Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an employer who complies with all provisions of this paragraph (g)(11) when installing, removing, repairing, or maintaining intact pipeline asphaltic wrap, or roof flashings which contain asbestos fibers encapsulated or coated by bituminous or resinous compounds shall be deemed to be in compliance with this section. If an employer does not comply with all provisions of this paragraph (g)(11) or if during the course of the job the material does not remain intact, the provisions of paragraph (g)(8) of this section apply instead of this paragraph (g)(11).

[FR Doc. 98-17091 Filed 6-26-98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510-26-U

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Parts 404, 405, 406, and 407**

**46 CFR Parts 401, 402, 403, and 404**

[USCG-1998-3976]

**Great Lakes Pilotage; Reorganization of Regulations**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation's (SLSDC) responsibility for administering the Secretary's functions under the Great Lakes Pilotage Act, as amended, (GLPA) was transferred from the SLSDC to the U.S. Coast Guard on March 5, 1998. This rule relocates the Great Lakes Pilotage regulations from their current place in Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, to their original place in Title 46, Code of Federal Regulations. Relocation of these regulations is necessary to position Great Lakes Pilotage rules with other U.S. Coast Guard regulations, and not with other SLSDC regulations. This rule also makes conforming amendments to the regulations to reflect U.S. Coast Guard responsibilities under the GPLA.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective June 30, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents as indicated in this preamble are available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility, (USCG-1998-3976), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington DC 20590-00001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For questions on this rule, contact LTJG Mark A. Cunningham, U.S. Coast Guard, telephone 202-267-1534. For questions on viewing material in the docket, contact Dorothy Walker, Chief, Documents, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Regulatory History**

This rulemaking relates to departmental management, organization, procedure, and practice. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)A, notice and public comment are unnecessary with respect to rules of this nature. Therefore, a notice of proposed rulemaking was not published prior to this rulemaking. For the same reason, good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after its publication date as is ordinarily required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d).

**Background and Purpose**

In 1994, the Secretary of Transportation (the Secretary) formed a study group to determine where to best locate the authority to execute the functions vested in him by the GPLA. Among other powers and duties, the GPLA authorizes the Secretary to examine pilots, register them, and set rates for their services. Because the study group recommended transferring these functions from the U.S. Coast Guard to the SLSDC, the Secretary withdrew the Coast Guard's authority in these matters and redelegated it to the SLSDC (December 11, 1995; 60 FR 63444). On November 12, 1997, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in *Halverson v. Slater*, 129 F.3d 180 (D.C. Cir, 1997), reversed a district court decision and held that the Secretary lacks the authority, under 49 U.S.C. 322(b), to delegate Great Lakes Pilotage Act powers and duties to the SLSDC. The court vacated the December 11, 1995 rule and determined that, under 46 U.S.C. 2104(a), the Secretary may delegate these functions only to the U.S. Coast Guard. On March 5, 1998, the Secretary responded to the court's ruling by redelegating the authority to carry out functions under the GLPA to the U.S. Coast Guard (63 FR 10781-2).

This rulemaking relocates the Great Lakes Pilotage regulations from their current place in Title 33 to their original place in Title 46. Reorganization of the CFR is necessary to position Great Lakes Pilotage rules with other U.S. Coast Guard regulations, and not with other SLSDC regulations. This rule redesignates parts 404, 405, 406, and 407 of 33 CFR Chapter IV, as parts 401, 402, 403, and 404, respectively, of 46 CFR Chapter III.

This rule also makes conforming editorial changes to the redesignated sections that reflect the redelegation of Seaway responsibilities to the U.S. Coast Guard. For example, the word "Administrator" is changed to the word "Commandant" and the words "Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" are changed to the words "U.S. Coast Guard."

This rule also revises the authority citations of each redesignated part to reflect the renewed delegation of responsibilities from the Secretary to the U.S. Coast Guard.

**Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard considered whether this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.