

the worker group. Therefore, the Department is again amending the revised determination to reflect the correct impact date.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-52,777 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Steelcase, Inc., Grand Rapids, Michigan, including leased workers of RCM Technologies working at Steelcase, Inc., Grand Rapids, Michigan, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 12, 2002, through October 14, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 14th day of February, 2005.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5-685 Filed 2-18-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-55,216]

ITW Insulation Systems, Nitro, WV; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On January 11, 2005, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 21, 2005 (70 FR 3227).

The petition for the workers of ITW Insulation Systems, Nitro, West Virginia engaged in production of metal jacketing and industrial thermal insulation applications was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed no increase of imports of metal jacketing an industrial thermal insulation applications during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import metal jacketing and industrial thermal insulation applications in the relevant period nor did it shift production to a foreign country.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner requests to extend the period

for investigation beyond the relevant time period.

A review of the original investigation confirmed that the subject firm ceased its production on June 30, 2004. All the surveys and data requested from the subject firm and its customers reflected this date. The Department considers import impact in terms of the relevant period of the current investigation; therefore import impact that is outside the relevant period are irrelevant. The Department must conform to the Trade Act and associated regulations.

The petitioner further requested to extend the survey of customers to include those in the northeast.

Additional list of customers was requested from the subject firm. As a result, six additional largest customers were surveyed in the reconsideration process. These customers reported no imports of like or directly competitive products with those manufactured by the subject firm during the relevant period.

The petitioner also alleges that the subject firm "will be supplying their customer base from their facility in Canada."

A company official was contacted regarding the above allegation. The company official stated that no production has been shifted from the subject firm to Canada, nor is the United States operation importing from Canada.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of February, 2005.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 05-3355 Filed 2-18-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 81, Standard Specification for Granting of Patent Licenses.

2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0121.

3. *How often the collection is required:* Application for licenses are submitted once. Other reports are submitted annually or as other events required.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* Applicants for and holders of NRC Licenses to NRC inventions.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 1.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 37 hours estimated; however, no applications are anticipated during the next 3 years.

7. *Abstract:* 10 CFR Part 81 establishes the standard specifications for the issuance of licenses to rights in inventions covered by patents or patent applications invested in the United States, as represented by or in the custody of the Commission and other patents in which the Commission has legal rights.

Submit, by April 25, 2005, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton (T-5 F53),

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001, by
telephone at 301-415-7233, or by
Internet electronic mail to
INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day
of February 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information
Services.*

[FR Doc. 05-3263 Filed 2-18-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-423]

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.; **Notice of Consideration of Issuance of** **Amendment to Facility Operating** **License, Proposed No Significant** **Hazards Consideration Determination,** **and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (NRC or the Commission)
is considering issuance of an
amendment to Facility Operating
License No. NPF-49 issued to the
Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3 for
operation in New London County,
Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would
revise Technical Specification 3/4.3.2,
"Engineered Safety Features Actuation
System Instrumentation," Table 3.3-3,
extending the allowed outage time for
the Emergency Generator Load
Sequencer (EGLS) from 6 hours to 12
hours. This extension was requested to
support maintenance on the EGLS
which would correct a recently
identified failure of the automatic test
circuit for the 'A' EGLS.

Before issuance of the proposed
license amendment, the Commission
will have made findings required by the
Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended
(the Act), and the Commission's
regulations.

The Commission has made a
proposed determination that the
amendment request involves no
significant hazards consideration.
Pursuant to the Commission's
regulations in Title 10 of the Code of
Federal Regulations (10 CFR), section
50.92, this means that operation of the
facility in accordance with the proposed
amendment would not (1) involve a
significant increase in the probability or
consequences of an accident previously
evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of
a new or different kind of accident from
any accident previously evaluated; or
(3) involve a significant reduction in a

margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR
50.91(a), the licensee has provided its
analysis of the issue of no significant
hazards consideration, which is
presented below:

Criterion 1:

Does the proposed amendment involve a
significant increase in the probability or
consequences of an accident previously
evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change increases the allowed
time to restore the inoperable EGLS to
operable status from 6 to 12 hours. The
proposed change does not modify any plant
equipment and does not impact any failure
modes that could lead to an accident.
Additionally, the proposed change has no
effect on the consequence of any analyzed
accident since the change does not affect the
function of any equipment credited for
accident mitigation. Based on this
discussion, the proposed amendment does
not increase the probability or consequences
of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2:

Does the proposed amendment create the
possibility of a new or different kind of
accident from any accident previously
evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change increases the allowed
time to restore the inoperable EGLS to
operable status from 6 to 12 hours. It does
not modify any plant equipment and there is
no impact on the capability of existing
equipment to perform its intended functions.
No system setpoints are being modified and
no changes are being made to the method in
which plant operations are conducted. No
new failure modes are introduced by the
proposed changes. The proposed amendment
does not introduce accident initiators or
malfunctions that would cause a new or
different kind of accident. Therefore, the
proposed amendment does not create the
possibility of a new or different kind of
accident from any accident previously
evaluated.

Criterion 3:

Does the proposed amendment involve a
significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change increases the allowed
time to restore the inoperable EGLS to
operable status from 6 to 12 hours. The
proposed change does not affect any of the
assumptions used in the accident analysis,
nor does it affect any operability
requirements for equipment important to
plant safety. Therefore, the proposed change
will not result in a significant reduction in
the margin of safety as defined in the Bases
for Technical Specifications covered in this
License Amendment Request.

The NRC staff has reviewed the
licensee's analysis and, based on this
review, it appears that the three
standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are
satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff
proposes to determine that the
amendment request involves no
significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public
comments on this proposed
determination. Any comments received
within 30 days after the date of
publication of this notice will be
considered in making any final
determination.

Normally, the Commission will not
issue the amendment until the
expiration of the 30-day notice period.
However, should circumstances change
during the notice period such that
failure to act in a timely way would
result, for example, in derating or
shutdown of the facility, the
Commission may issue the license
amendment before the expiration of the
30-day notice period, provided that its
final determination is that the
amendment involves no significant
hazards consideration. The final
determination will consider all public
and State comments received. Should
the Commission take this action, it will
publish in the **Federal Register** a notice
of issuance and provide for opportunity
for a hearing after issuance. The
Commission expects that the need to
take this action will occur very
infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted
by mail to the Chief, Rules and
Directives Branch, Division of
Administrative Services, Office of
Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, Washington, DC 20555-
0001, and should cite the publication
date and page number of this **Federal
Register** notice. Written comments may
also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two
White Flint North, 11545 Rockville
Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30
a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays.
Documents may be examined, and/or
copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public
Document Room, located at One White
Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21,
11555 Rockville Pike (first floor),
Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and
petitions for leave to intervene is
discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of
publication of this notice, the licensee
may file a request for a hearing with
respect to issuance of the amendment to
the subject facility operating license and
any person whose interest may be
affected by this proceeding and who
wishes to participate as a party in the
proceeding must file a written request
for a hearing and a petition for leave to
intervene. Requests for a hearing and a
petition for leave to intervene shall be
filed in accordance with the
Commission's "Rules of Practice for
Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10
CFR Part 2. Interested persons should
consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309,