KS010029 (Mar. 02, 2001)
KS010035 (Mar. 02, 2001)
KS010069 (Mar. 02, 2001)
KS010070 (Mar. 02, 2001)
Missouri
MO010001 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010002 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010003 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010006 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010010 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010011 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010041 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010048 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010049 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010050 (Mar. 02, 2001)
MO010065 (Mar. 02, 2001)
Nebraska
NE010021 (Mar. 02, 2001)
Texas
TX010002 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010003 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010004 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010005 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010007 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010010 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010014 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010033 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010034 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010037 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010046 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010054 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010093 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010096 (Mar. 02, 2001)
TX010121 (Mar. 02, 2001)

Volume VI

Idaho
ID010001 (Mar. 02, 2001)
ID010002 (Mar. 02, 2001)
Washington
WA010001 (Mar. 02, 2001)
WA010002 (Mar. 02, 2001)
WA010007 (Mar. 02, 2001)
WA010011 (Mar. 02, 2001)

Volume VII

None

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.

General wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts are available electronically at no cost on the Government Printing Office site at *www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon.* They are also 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 1–800–363–2068.

Hard copy subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing office, Washington, DC 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 six 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 will be distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd Day of May 2001.

Carl J. Poleskey,

Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 01–11633 Filed 5–10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs

Notice of Reinstatement of Milwaukee Fence Co.

AGENCY: Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Notice of reinstatement, Milwaukee Fence Co.

SUMMARY: This notice advises that Milwaukee Fence Co., has been reinstated as an eligible bidder on Federal and federally assisted construction contracts and subcontracts. For further information, contact Harold M. Bush, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Federal Contact Compliance, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room C–3325, Washington, DC 20210 (202) 693–1072.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Milwaukee Fence Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is as of this date, reinstated as an eligible bidder on Federal and federally assisted construction contracts and subconstracts.

Signed at Washington, DC this 4th day of May, 2001.

Harold M. Busch,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Federal Contract Compliance.

[FR Doc. 01–11908 Filed 5–10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Labor Research Advisory Council; Notice of Meetings and Agenda

The Spring meetings of committees of the Labor Research Advisory Council will be held on June 4, 5, and 6, 2001. All of the meetings will be held in the Conference Center, of the Postal Square Building (PSB), 2 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Washington, DC.

The Labor Research Advisory Council and its committees advise the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to technical matters associated with the Bureau's programs. Membership consists of union research directors and staff members. The schedule and agenda of the meetings are as follows:

Monday, June 4, 2001

9:30 a.m.—Committee on Productivity, Technology and Growth—Meeting Room 9

1. Possible measurement bias in aggregate productivity measures: Update of Gullickson-Harper paper
2. Developments in industry productivity studies
3. Status of the 2000–10 projections
4. Topics for the next meeting

Committee on Foreign Labor Statistics

1. Update on activities of the Division of International Technical Cooperation
2. Preliminary report on development of hourly compensation measures for additional countries
3. Topics for the next meeting

1:30 p.m.—Committee on Employment and Unemployment Statistics—Meeting Room 9

1. Latest results from National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY)97 and NLSY79 surveys
2. Current Population Survey (CPS) topics:
   a. Data on union membership
   b. Update on the CPS–CES gap, based on latest information from 2000 Census
   c. Discussion of issues related to measuring labor force activity of the prison population
3. Developments in the Local Area Unemployment Statistics and Mass Layoff Statistics programs
4. Topics for the next meeting

Tuesday, June 5, 2001

1:30 p.m.—Committee on Compensation and Working Conditions—Meeting Room 9

1. Welcome, Introductions

2. Update on data for the Federal white-collar pay setting process
3. Employee Benefits Survey: status and data availability
4. Data on working conditions from BLS
5. Bonuses, lump-sum payments, and other forms of variable pay
6. Topics for the next meeting

Wednesday, June 6, 2001

9:30 a.m.—Committee on Prices and Living Conditions—Meeting Room 9

1. Update on program developments
   a. Consumer Price Index
   b. International Price Indexes
   c. Producer Price Indexes
2. Topics for the next meeting

1:30 p.m.—Committee on Occupational Safety and Health Statistics—Meeting Room 9

1. Report on worker and case circumstances data from the 1999 Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses
2. Discussion of changes to the Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses resulting from the revision of the OSHA record keeping rule
3. Report on the status of the Survey of Respirator Use and Practices
4. Update on the introduction of the North American Industry Classification System into the Survey of Occupational Injuries and Ilnesses and the Census of Fatal Occupational injuries
5. Proposed FY 2002 budget
6. Topics for the next meeting

The meetings are open to the public. Persons planning to attend these meetings as observers may want to contact Wilhelmina Abner on 202–691–5970.

Signed at Washington, DC this 30th day of April, 2001.

Katharine G. Abraham,

Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 01–11907 Filed 5–10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–P

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION

The United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

National Environmental Policy Act Pilot Projects; Comment Request; Announcement of Workshop

AGENCY: Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution.

ACTION: Meeting notice and request for public comment.

SUMMARY: At the request of U.S. Senators Max Baucus, Mike Crapo, Harry Reid, and Craig Thomas, the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is exploring how pilot projects can be used to determine how collaboration, consensus building, and appropriate dispute resolution processes can improve the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in the context of federal lands and natural resource management issues. In the past months, the U.S. Institute, with the assistance of the Meridian Institute, has sought input from a diverse group of individuals representing environmental organizations, resource users, federal, state and local governments, tribes, participants in local and regional collaborative processes, and NEPA experts. The purpose of these individual conversations was to learn more about (1) What specific concerns or issues should be addressed by pilot projects, (2) what parameters should define the pilot projects initiative, (3) what criteria should be used to select pilot projects, (4) what institutional mechanisms would be needed to assure project oversight, implementation, and evaluation, and (5) how to maximize the likelihood that positive lessons learned from the pilots can be mainstreamed and begin to influence the implementation of NEPA in the future.

A number of perceived problems with both NEPA implementation and collaborative processes were identified through these early conversations. Among the reported problems with NEPA implementation were:

- Inconsistent implementation of NEPA's statutory requirements, implementing regulations and agency guidelines;
- Inadequate coordination among federal agencies with overlapping jurisdictions and inadequate intergovernmental coordination with state agencies;
- Overemphasis on NEPA documentation and litigation protection, rather than sounder strategic planning and decision-making;
- Inefficient and duplicative processes; and
- Inadequate attention to realizing the goals laid out in Section 101 of NEPA.

The issues relating to collaborative processes and conflict resolution can be placed into four organizational contexts:

- Interagency collaboration,
- Intergovernmental collaboration,
- Governmentally organized multi-stakeholder collaboration, and
- Privately organized collaborative processes.

Across these contexts, various problems were raised, such as:

- A lack of guidance on options for agencies and inconsistent approaches to collaboration resulting in confusion;
- The resource intensive nature of such processes and inadequate process funding;
- Lack of clarity on stakeholder roles and responsibilities, and inadequate stakeholder guidance;.
- Maintaining balanced stakeholder representation; and
- Overemphasis on process of collaboration as an end itself and inadequate attention to planning outcomes, decision-making, and implementation.

The U.S. Institute proposes that pilot projects may be useful in addressing the perceived challenges of NEPA implementation and providing clearer guidance regarding the use of collaborative processes in NEPA implementation to agencies, state and local governments, tribes and non-governmental interests with respect to public lands and natural resources management issues. Specifically, pilot projects could:

- Clearly distinguish problems and concerns related to NEPA and the manner in which NEPA is being implemented from concerns about other environmental statutes and/or broader societal concerns;
- Demonstrate innovative and practical solutions to clearly delineated NEPA implementation problems; and
- Provide information about the conditions under which collaborative problem solving, consensus-building, and dispute resolution processes can improve implementation of NEPA.

There are differing views regarding the effectiveness of NEPA implementation, reflecting legitimate underlying differences in values and perspectives about the nature and extent of the environmental impacts of proposed projects and how these impacts can best be avoided or mitigated. Most would agree, however, there is room for improvement in the application of NEPA procedures and in the achievement of its substantive objectives articulated in Section 101. Collaborative processes and conflict resolution strategies often involve or implicate NEPA review and analysis activities. Well-managed and highly visible pilot projects may bring to light important lessons for better integrating effective collaboration into NEPA activities and improving the quality and durability of management decisions informed by NEPA analyses.