

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 274-5721
FAX (916) 274-5743
www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb



**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING/BUSINESS MEETING
OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD
AND NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO TITLE 8
OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.4 and the provisions of Labor Code Sections 142.1, 142.2, 142.3, 142.4, and 144.6, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board of the State of California has set the time and place for a Public Meeting, Public Hearing, and Business Meeting:

PUBLIC MEETING: On **April 21, 2005**, at 10:00 a.m.
in the Auditorium of the Harris State Building,
1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California 94612-1499

At the Public Meeting, the Board will make time available to receive comments or proposals from interested persons on any item concerning occupational safety and health.

PUBLIC HEARING: On **April 21, 2005**, following the Public Meeting
in the Auditorium of the Harris State Building,
1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California 94612-1499

At the Public Hearing, the Board will consider the public testimony on the proposed changes to occupational safety and health standards in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations.

BUSINESS MEETING: On **April 21, 2005**, following the Public Hearing
in the Auditorium of the Harris State Building,
1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California 94612-1499

At the Business Meeting, the Board will conduct its monthly business.

The meeting facilities and restrooms are accessible to the physically disabled. Requests for accommodations for the disabled (assistive listening device, sign language interpreters, etc.) should be made to the Board office no later than 10 working days prior to the day of the meeting. If Paratransit services are needed, please contact the Paratransit office nearest you.

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD**

STEVEN L. RANK, Chairman

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO TITLE 8
OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
BY THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.4 and Labor Code Sections 142.1, 142.4 and 144.5, that the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board pursuant to the authority granted by Labor Code Section 142.3, and to implement Labor Code Section 142.3, will consider the following proposed revisions to Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders and Telecommunications Safety Orders of the California Code of Regulations, as indicated below, at its Public Hearing **on April 21, 2005**.

1. TITLE 8: **GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS**
Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 96, Section 4968
and Article 99, New Section 5022.1
**Tower Crane Warning Devices and
Crane Test Weight Requirements**

2. TITLE 8: **TELECOMMUNICATIONS SAFETY ORDERS**
Chapter 7, Subchapter 21, Article 1
Section 8615
Fall Protection for Telecommunication Workers

A description of the proposed changes are as follows:

1. TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS
Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 96, Section 4968
and Article 99, New Section 5022.1
**Tower Crane Warning Devices and
Crane Test Weight Requirements**

INFORMATIVE DIGEST OF PROPOSED ACTION/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

This rulemaking action was initiated at the request of the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Division). The Division submitted two Form 9s, Request for New, or Change in Existing Safety Order, dated February 4, 2000 and July 20, 2000, outlining the need for amendments in the requirements pertaining to tower crane warning devices in General Industry Safety Orders (GISO) Section 4968, and the need for requirements regarding crane test weights.

The Division stated that existing Section 4968 permits cranes to be overloaded because the audible warning signal and automatic stop must be activated at 105 and 110 percent of the rated load¹, respectively. Cranes are designed to operate up to 100 percent of the rated load. The Division stated that most, if not all, tower crane manufacturers do not recommend overloading their cranes under any conditions. Consequently, amendments are proposed to address these concerns.

The Division further recommended a new crane standard, GISO Section 5022.1 be established to address requirements related to test weights used for the purpose of proof load testing of cranes and derricks. During several job site inspections, the Division identified test weights that lacked structural integrity with regard to their design, particularly the lifting attachments, which were made from wire rope or reinforcing steel (rebar). Inadequately designed test weights may break or fail during the lifting process resulting in crane collapse due to sudden release of the test weight.

This rulemaking action addresses the Division's aforementioned concerns and recommendations, and was developed with the assistance of an advisory committee.

Section 4968. Safety Devices.

Existing Section 4968 provides requirements for tower crane safety devices. The section requires visual warning devices, an audible signal and an automatic stop, all of which must operate at a percentage of the crane's rated load (i.e. 100, 105, and 110 percent, respectively). Other requirements in this section pertain to limit devices and the use of constant pressure controls.

Subsection (a)

Existing subsections (a)(1) and (2), require that a tower crane must be equipped with either a warning light that activates at 100 percent of the rated load, or that the crane be equipped with electric instrumentation that gives a continuous reading of the load weight and the trolley radius. An amendment

¹ The "rated load" is the maximum load for which a crane or individual hoist is designed and built by the manufacturer and as shown on the equipment nameplate(s) or load capacity chart.

is proposed for subsection (a)(1) to reduce the activation point of the warning light from the existing requirement of 100 percent to “a percentage of the rated load, not to exceed 95 percent of the rated load.” The proposed amendments will have the effect of providing the crane operator a visual warning before the load reaches 100 percent of its capacity and will also permit activation of the warning light below 95 percent of the rated load.

Subsection (b)

Existing subsection (b) requires an audible signal that operates at 105 percent of a crane’s rated load. An amendment is proposed to reduce the activation point of the audible signal from the existing requirement of 105 percent, to “a percentage of the rated load not to exceed 100 percent of the rated load.” The proposed amendments will have the effect of providing the crane operator an audible warning once the load reaches 100 percent of its capacity and will also permit activation of the audible signal below 100 percent of the rated load.

New subsection (c)

A new subsection (c) is proposed that would require the visual warning light, and audible signal in subsections (a)(1) and (b) to be set to avoid simultaneous activation, and operate with a difference of at least 5 percent of the rated load. The proposed amendment would have the effect of ensuring that these warning devices do not simultaneously activate providing the crane operator with clear and independent warnings.

Subsection (d)

Existing subsection (c) is lettered subsection (d) in the proposal, and currently requires an automatic stop that must operate at 110 percent of the rated load. Cranes are designed to operate at 100 percent of the rated load, however, an automatic stop that activates at 110 percent of the rated load could potentially result in an overload condition. An amendment is proposed to require an automatic stop that operates at a percentage of the rated load, not to exceed 105 percent of the rated load. The effect of this amendment would be to permit cranes to operate safely without reducing the designed lifting capacity of the crane.

New subsection (e)

A new proposed subsection (e) would require that when the crane manufacturer specifies lower activation points for safety devices than required by subsections (a)(1), (b) and (d), the manufacturers’ specifications shall be followed. The proposed subsection will ensure that the proposal does not conflict with manufacturer’s specifications when provided, and that the employer follows the manufacturer’s specifications for activation of warning devices and the automatic stop.

Existing subsections (d) and (e) are proposed for relettering as (f) and (g), respectively.

New Section 5022.1. Test Weights.

The scope of this proposed new section pertains to requirements for test weights manufactured for the purpose of proof load testing of cranes and derricks.

Subsection (a)

Proposed subsection (a) requires that test weights be legibly marked to indicate the documented weight. The effect of this subsection is to ensure that test weights are marked so that the weight can be easily read and identified by personnel.

Subsection (b)

Proposed subsection (b) requires lifting attachments on test weights to be visually inspected prior to each use. Subsection (b) also specifies that damaged or defective lifting attachments that are not suitable for safe use shall not be used. The effect of this provision would be that the lifting attachments are inspected prior to each use for any cracks, deformity, or wear that might affect their structural integrity. Moreover, it prevents any damaged or defective lifting attachments not suitable for safe use from being used.

Subsection (c)

Proposed subsection (c) prohibits the use of embedded wire rope and reinforcing steel (rebar) for use as lifting attachments. According to representatives in the crane industry, wire rope and rebar are unacceptable materials for use as test weight lifting attachments. Rebar is comprised of low-grade steel that is not designed for use as a test weight lifting attachment point and for the loads imposed in proof load testing of cranes. Further, wire rope used repetitively as a fixed lifting attachment in a test weight is subject to fraying, wearing and kinking and other defects all of which increase the likelihood of failure during proof load testing. The proposal would have the effect of prohibiting these inferior materials for use as test weight lifting attachments.

COST ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED ACTION

Costs or Savings to State Agencies

No costs or savings to state agencies will result as a consequence of the proposed action. Proposed amendments for Section 4968 are specific to tower cranes and the Board is not aware of any state agencies that own tower cranes. With respect to proposed new Section 5022.1, "Test Weights," the California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Transportation each own approximately 12 mobile cranes that would require proof load testing. Board staff contacted the Health and Safety Departments of these two agencies and was advised that neither agency owns their own test weights. Proof load testing of these cranes is contracted out to crane certificating agencies. Both state agencies stated that the proposal should not result in any measurable cost impact. Further, the rationale under the heading "Impact on Businesses" explains that costs to businesses resulting from the proposal are expected to be negligible.

Impact on Housing Costs

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not significantly affect housing costs.

Impact on Businesses

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not result in a significant statewide adverse economic impact affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. Proposed amendments for Section 4968 related to tower crane safety

devices would require resetting the activation settings for the warning light, audible signal, and the automatic stop on some cranes. Advisory committee members, however, indicated that this would simply be a matter of readjusting the setting points on the crane circuit board. The existing crane orders already require that a certified manufacturer's representative be present when a tower crane is erected or dismantled, and that the representative is qualified to make any necessary adjustments to warning device settings.

Proposed new Section 5022.1, "Test Weights," would require that test weights be legibly marked to indicate the documented weight, and that they be visually inspected prior to each use. These requirements should not result in cost impact to the employer as nearly all test weights are marked to indicate the weight, and inspecting test weights prior to use is a procedural requirement. Concrete block test weights are one type of test weight used to proof load test cranes, and a minority of concrete test weights have wire rope or rebar lifting attachments. Proposed Section 5022.1(c) would prohibit test weights with embedded wire rope or rebar used as lifting attachment points. However, existing test weights with wire rope or rebar lifting attachments could still be used for load testing within an appropriately designed lifting frame or lifting rack, or within a properly rigged sling. Consequently, the cost impact on businesses is expected to be negligible.

Cost Impact on Private Persons or Businesses

The Board is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

Costs or Savings in Federal Funding to the State

The proposal will not result in costs or savings in federal funding to the state.

Costs or Savings to Local Agencies or School Districts Required to be Reimbursed

No costs to local agencies or school districts are required to be reimbursed. See explanation under "Determination of Mandate."

Other Nondiscretionary Costs or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies

This proposal does not impose nondiscretionary costs or savings on local agencies.

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board has determined that the proposed standards do not impose a local mandate. Therefore, reimbursement by the State is not required pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code because the proposed amendments will not require local agencies or school districts to incur additional costs in complying with the proposal. Furthermore, these standards do not constitute a "new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution."

The California Supreme Court has established that a "program" within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution is one which carries out the governmental function of providing services to the public, or which, to implement a state policy, imposes unique requirements on

local governments and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state. (County of Los Angeles v. State of California (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.)

These proposed standards do not require local agencies to carry out the governmental function of providing services to the public. Rather, these standards require local agencies to take certain steps to ensure the safety and health of their own employees only. Moreover, these proposed standards do not in any way require local agencies to administer the California Occupational Safety and Health program. (See City of Anaheim v. State of California (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1478.)

These proposed standards do not impose unique requirements on local governments. All state, local and private employers will be required to comply with the prescribed standards.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The Board has determined that the proposed amendments may affect small businesses. However, no economic impact is anticipated. Also, see the comments above under the heading, "Impact on Businesses."

ASSESSMENT

The adoption of the proposed amendments to these standards will neither create nor eliminate jobs in the State of California nor result in the elimination of existing businesses or create or expand businesses in the State of California.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Our Board must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

2. TITLE 8: **TELECOMMUNICATIONS SAFETY ORDERS**
Chapter 7, Subchapter 21, Article 1
Section 8615(g)
Fall Protection for Telecommunication Workers

INFORMATIVE DIGEST OF PROPOSED ACTION/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

This rulemaking action is being initiated at the request of the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Division). The Division submitted a Form 9, Request for New, or Change in Existing Safety Order, dated January 16, 2003, recommending that Section 8615(g) of the Telecommunication Safety Orders (TSO), which contains fall protection requirements for telecommunication industry workers, be updated for consistency with similar fall protection provisions contained in the Electrical Safety Orders. The Division noted former rulemaking actions that amended Section 2940.6 High Voltage Electrical Safety Orders (HVESO), and Section 2320.8 of the Low Voltage Electrical Safety Orders (LVESO) such that both Electrical Safety Orders contain language verbatim of each other with regard to how and when

electrical workers are to be protected from falling from elevated locations when working from poles, towers, and similar structures, with the exception of point to point travel.

The Division and Board staff note that because existing language in TSO Section 8615(g) is silent with regard to point to point travel, it may be interpreted by the California Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board (OSHAB) to only require employees to use fall protection when they are working at a stationary, elevated location on a pole, tower or other structure. In an OSHAB Decision in the Matter of the Appeal of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 84-R1D2-850, dated March 7, 1985, an administrative law judge (ALJ) granted the employer's appeal regarding an alleged violation of HVESO Section 2940.6(b)(1), which at the time was essentially verbatim of existing TSO Section 8615(g). In the decision, the ALJ stated "climbing up or descending from an elevated position on a power pole is not the same as working at an elevated location on the pole and therefore no personal fall protection is required." Both the Division and Board staff find the resulting condition places telecommunication workers at risk of a fall from an elevated location regardless of whether they are working at a fixed position or moving from point to point.

The Division and Board staffs agree that existing TSO Section 8615(g) must be updated for consistency with industry practice and other Title 8 requirements, which similarly address this issue. Board staff concurs with the Division's proposed language for amending Section 8615(g) as contained in their January 16, 2003, Memorandum, and recognizes the telecommunication industry practice of allowing only qualified persons, as defined in the TSO, to engage in point to point travel under certain conditions without the use of fall protection, a distinction absent in existing Section 8615(g). The Board believes that the proposed amendments to Section 8615(g) will effectively clarify to employers when and what type of fall protection is required, while recognizing a reasonable exception to these requirements for point to point travel by experienced telecommunication workers.

In addition, as a result of further review and for consistency with other existing Title 8 fall protection requirements, the Board proposes clarifying amendments to existing Section 8615(f)(1) to eliminate the current association between fall arrest devices and body belts (which could subject employees to fall arrest forces and serious injury) and straps, consistent with existing Title 8 prohibitions contained in standards such as the Construction, Electrical and General Industry Safety Orders. To that end, an amendment to subsection (f)(1) is proposed which would contain a reference to the use of the personal fall protection devices outlined in the amendments to Section 8615(g) when standard railings meeting the requirements of General Industry Safety Orders Section 3209 are not provided on elevated work platforms.

This proposed rulemaking action contains minor, nonsubstantive revisions. These nonsubstantive revisions are not all discussed in this Informative Digest, however, these proposed revisions are clearly indicated in the regulatory text in underline and strikeout format. In addition to these nonsubstantive revisions, the following actions are proposed:

Section 8615. Overhead Lines.

Section 8615 contains various requirements specific to overhead lines that address the handling of suspension strands, testing of wood poles, pole inspections and tests, inspection and testing requirements for cable suspension strands, use of elevated work platforms, fall protection, installation and removal of cables and wires, work around energized conductors and the use of metal tapes and ropes.

Subsection (f)(1) specifies that unless standard railings meeting the requirements of Section 3209 of the General Industry Safety Orders are provided, suitable fall-arresting devices such as safety straps and body belts shall be used while working on elevated work platforms including aerial splicing platforms, pole platforms, ladder platforms, pole balconies and pole seats. For consistency with other Title 8 fall protection requirements, including the proposed amendments to Section 8615(g), it is proposed to revise subsection (f)(1) to require that personal fall protection devices as specified in subsection (g) shall be used when standard railings are not provided. The proposed revision will have no effect other than to clarify which fall protection devices are permitted thus ensuring consistency in fall protection requirements contained throughout Title 8.

Subsection (g) requires that when employees work more than 4 feet above the ground on poles, towers or similar structures, employers are to require that employees use body belts/safety belts and safety straps/lanyards. It is proposed to title the subsection "Fall Protection," and revise it to read, "When work is performed at elevated locations more than 4 feet (1.2 meters) above ground on poles, towers or similar structures, the employer shall require the employees to use either fall arrest equipment, work positioning equipment or travel restricting equipment, if other fall protection methods have not been provided (e.g., guardrails, safety nets, etc.)." It is also proposed to prohibit the use of body belts as part of a fall arrest system, consistent with other existing Title 8 fall protection standards, and include an exception which permits point to point travel by a qualified person unless conditions such as ice, high winds (as defined in Section 2951(f) of the High Voltage Electrical Safety Orders), design of the structure, or other conditions (e.g., chemical contaminants) prevent the employee from gaining a firm hand or foothold while traveling.

The proposed amendments are verbatim of fall protection requirements contained in Sections 2320.8 and 2940.6 of the Low and High Voltage Electrical Safety Orders, respectively, and are necessary for consistency purposes. The revisions will have the effect of clarifying to the employer when and what type of fall protection is necessary to protect telecommunication employees working at elevated locations, and to permit point to point travel under specified conditions.

COST ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED ACTION

Costs or Savings to State Agencies

No costs or savings to state agencies will result as a consequence of the proposed action as Board staff has not identified any state agencies that perform telecommunications work from poles, towers or similar structures. Typically such services are not performed by state employees but are contracted out to private sector providers.

Impact on Housing Costs

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not significantly affect housing costs.

Impact on Businesses

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not result in a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposal clarifies what type of fall protection is to be used, either personal fall protection or conventional fall protection (safety nets, guardrails), and when

telecommunication workers may be allowed to work without the use of fall protection, i.e., point to point travel.

Cost Impact on Private Persons or Businesses

The Board is not aware of any cost impact that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

Costs or Savings in Federal Funding to the State

The proposal will not result in costs or savings in federal funding to the state.

Costs or Savings to Local Agencies or School Districts Required to be Reimbursed

No costs to local agencies or school districts are required to be reimbursed. See explanation under "Determination of Mandate."

Other Nondiscretionary Costs or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies

This proposal does not impose nondiscretionary costs or savings on local agencies.

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board has determined that the proposed standards do not impose a local mandate. Therefore, reimbursement by the state is not required pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code because the proposed amendments will not require local agencies or school districts to incur additional costs in complying with the proposal. Furthermore, these standards do not constitute a "new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution."

The California Supreme Court has established that a "program" within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution is one which carries out the governmental function of providing services to the public, or which, to implement a state policy, imposes unique requirements on local governments and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state. (County of Los Angeles v. State of California (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.)

These proposed standards do not require local agencies to carry out the governmental function of providing services to the public. Rather, the standards require local agencies to take certain steps to ensure the safety and health of their own employees only. Moreover, these proposed standards do not in any way require local agencies to administer the California Occupational Safety and Health program. (See City of Anaheim v. State of California (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1478.)

These proposed standards do not impose unique requirements on local governments. All employers - state, local and private - will be required to comply with the prescribed standards.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The Board has determined that the proposed amendments may affect small businesses. However, no economic impact is anticipated.

ASSESSMENT

The adoption of the proposed amendments to these standards will neither create nor eliminate jobs in the State of California nor result in the elimination of existing businesses or create or expand businesses in the State of California.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Our Board must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

A copy of the proposed changes in STRIKEOUT/UNDERLINE format is available upon request made to the Occupational Safety and Health Standard Board's Office, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833, (916) 274-5721. Copies will also be available at the Public Hearing.

An INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS containing a statement of the purpose and factual basis for the proposed actions, identification of the technical documents relied upon, and a description of any identified alternatives has been prepared and is available upon request from the Standards Board's Office.

Notice is also given that any interested person may present statements or arguments orally or in writing at the hearing on the proposed changes under consideration. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted so that they are received no later than April 15, 2005. The official record of the rulemaking proceedings will be closed at the conclusion of the public hearing and written comments received after 5:00 p.m. on April 21, 2005, will not be considered by the Board unless the Board announces an extension of time in which to submit written comments. Written comments should be mailed to the address provided below or submitted by fax at (916) 274-5743 or e-mailed at oshsb@hq.dir.ca.gov. The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board may thereafter adopt the above proposal substantially as set forth without further notice.

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board's rulemaking file on the proposed actions including all the information upon which the proposals are based are open to public inspection Monday through Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Standards Board's Office, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833.

The full text of proposed changes, including any changes or modifications that may be made as a result of the public hearing, shall be available from the Executive Officer 15 days prior to the date on which the Standards Board adopts the proposed changes.

Inquiries concerning either the proposed administrative action or the substance of the proposed changes may be directed to Keith Umemoto, Executive Officer, or Michael Manieri, Principal Safety Engineer, at (916) 274-5721.

You can access the Board's notice and other materials associated with this proposal on the Standards Board's homepage/website address which is <http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb>. Once the Final Statement of Reasons is prepared, it may be obtained by accessing the Board's website or by calling the telephone number listed above.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD

STEVEN L. RANK, Chairman

TITLE 8

GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS

CHAPTER 4, SUBCHAPTER 7, ARTICLE 96, SECTION 4968

AND ARTICLE 99, NEW SECTION 5022.1

**TOWER CRANE WARNING DEVICES AND
CRANE TEST WEIGHT REQUIREMENTS**

TITLE 8

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SAFETY ORDERS

CHAPTER 7, SUBCHAPTER 21, ARTICLE 1

SECTION 8615(g)

FALL PROTECTION FOR TELECOMMUNICATION WORKERS

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS
INTO TITLE 8, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
BY THE
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD

After proceedings held in accordance with and pursuant to the authority vested in Sections 142, 142.3 and 142.4, of the Labor Code to implement, interpret, or make specific, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, by a majority vote, adopted additions, revisions, or deletions to the California Code of Regulations as follows:

1. Title 8: Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 10, Section 3380(d), Personal Protective Equipment.

Heard at the August 19, 2004, Public Hearing; adopted on November 17, 2004; filed with the Secretary of State on December 30, 2004; and became effective on January 29, 2005.

2. Title 8: Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 12, Section 3427, Tree Climbing and Access.

Heard at the June 17, 2004, Public Hearing; adopted on December 16, 2004; filed with the Secretary of State on January 24, 2005; and became effective on January 24, 2005.

3. Title 8: Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 107, Section 5144, Controlled Negative Pressure (CNP) REDON Fit Testing Procedures.

Heard at the December 16, 2004, Public Hearing; adopted on January 20, 2005; filed with the Secretary of State on January 26, 2005; and became effective on January 26, 2005.

4. Title 8: Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 13, Section 3456, Hand Weeding, Hand Thinning, and Hand-Capping Operations in Agriculture (Emergency Regulation).

Readopted on January 20, 2005; filed with the Secretary of State on January 26, 2005; will become effective on February 4, 2005; and will expire on June 7, 2005.

A copy of these standards are available upon request from the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833, (916) 274-5721.

If you have Internet access, visit the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board by going to: <http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb> and follow the links to the Standards Board. This information is updated monthly. The Standards Board's e-mail address is: oshsb@dir.ca.gov.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD

Keith Umemoto, Executive Officer