Office on behalf of workers at SB Acquisition, LLC, d/b/a Saunders Brothers, Fryeburg, Maine.
The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 29th day of July 2008.

Linda G. Poole, 
Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–18167 Filed 8–6–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,864]

Ametek, Inc., Measurement and Calibration Technology Division, Sellersville, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On June 16, 2008, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the Federal Register on June 25, 2008 (73 FR 36119).

The previous investigation initiated on February 21, 2008, resulted in a negative determination issued on April 18, 2008. The decision was based on the finding that the number of workers separated from the subject did not constitute a significant number or proportion of the subject worker group (at least 5 percent) and there was no threat of future separations. The denial notice was published in the Federal Register on May 2, 2008 (73 FR 24318).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied additional information regarding employment at the subject firm and indicated that a sufficient number of employees have been separated from the subject firm during November 2007.

It was subsequently revealed by the company official, that the subject firm separated a significant number of workers during the relevant period and there was a threat of future separations.

Upon further investigation it was determined that Ametek, Inc., Measurement and Calibration Technology Division, Sellersville, Pennsylvania supplied gauge component parts, including electrical cord reels, constant force springs, mechanical reels, and power springs that were used in the production of electronic instrumentation and gauges, and a loss of business with domestic manufacturers (whose workers were certified eligible to apply for adjustment assistance) contributed importantly to the workers’ separation or threat of separation. The parts supplied were related to the articles that were the basis of certification.

In accordance with Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Ametek, Inc., Measurement and Calibration Technology Division, Sellersville, Pennsylvania qualify as adversely affected secondary workers under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Ametek, Inc., Measurement and Calibration Technology Division, Sellersville, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 8, 2007, through two years from the date of this certification, 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.

Signed in Washington, DC this 30th day of July 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner, 
Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–18166 Filed 8–6–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[SGA/DFA–PY 08–04]

 Solicitation for Grant Applications (SGA); Technology-Based Learning (TBL) Initiative

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Labor.

ACTION: Notice: Amendment to SGA/ DFA–PY 08–04.

SUMMARY: The Employment and Training Administration published a document in the Federal Register on June 20, 2008, announcing the availability of funds and solicitation for grant applications (SGA) under the TBL Initiative to be awarded through a competitive process. This notice is a third amendment to the SGA and it amends “Part III. Eligibility Information,” under the specific heading “Eligible Applicants.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Stockton, Grant Officer, Division of Federal Assistance, at (202) 693–3335.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

CORRECTION: In the Federal Register of June 20, 2008, in FR Doc. E8–13967. On page 35158 under the second (2nd) paragraph, is amended to add a sub-paragraph to read: “A Workforce Investment Board, in partnership with representatives from the education and training community and industry in high-growth/high demand fields.”

EFFECTIVE DATE: This notice is effective August 7, 2008.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of August, 2008.

James W. Stockton, 
Grant Officer.

[FR Doc. E8–18172 Filed 8–6–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–63,632]

Luxmovera, dba Uplinkearth, Somerset, NJ; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on July 1, 2008, in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of workers at Luxmovera, dba Uplinkearth, Somerset, New Jersey.
The petitioners have requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 1st day of August 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,
Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–18162 Filed 8–6–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
[Docket No. 40–8903; License No. SUA–1471]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Related to the Issuance of a License Amendment for Construction of a Third Evaporation Pond, Homestake Mining Company of California Grants, New Mexico Project

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Summary of environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Buckley, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop: T8F5, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Telephone: (301) 415–6607; e-mail: john.buckley@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1.0 Introduction

Below is a summary of the Environmental Assessment (EA). The complete EA is available in Agency-wide Documents Access Management System (ADAMS), at Accession No.: ML080920594.

1.1 Background

Homestake Mining Corporation (HMC), through a variety of partnerships and joint venture associations, operated a uranium milling operation in Cibola County, New Mexico, beginning in 1958, and continuing through 1990. The site is north of the City of Grants in Section 26, Township 12 North, Range 10 West. Since 1990, the site has been in reclamation. Site reclamation includes facility decommissioning, tailings impoundment area restoration, groundwater restoration and monitoring, and post-closure care and monitoring. The site is licensed under NRC License SUA–1471. During operations, approximately 22 million tons of ore were milled at the site, using a conventional alkaline leach process (NRC, 1993). From 1993 to 1995, the mill was decommissioned and demolished. After the mill was demolished, final surface reclamation commenced in accordance with the amended U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) requirements (NRC, 2006). Surface reclamation is nearly complete, with final reclamation and stabilization to be completed after groundwater restoration is completed. Groundwater contamination from past mill activities remains, and groundwater restoration is the primary activity occurring at the site. Once groundwater quality restoration is complete and approved, the site will be transferred to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), which will have the responsibility for long-term site care and maintenance.

HMC currently manages a groundwater restoration program, as defined by NRC License SUA–1471, and New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Discharge Plan (DP), DP–200 and DP–725 (HMC, 2007b). The current groundwater restoration program is also under the oversight of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region VI Superfund Program. The restoration program is a dynamic ongoing strategy based on a groundwater reclamation plan, which began in 1977. Additional evaluation of the groundwater restoration program recently has identified the need to extend the program, by approximately four years, to 2017, to finish cleanup objectives. HMC’s long-term goal is to restore the groundwater aquifer system in the area, as close as practicable, to the up-gradient groundwater quality background levels. The restoration program is designed to remove target contaminants from the groundwater through use of injection and collection systems, utilizing deep-well supplied fresh water or water produced from the reverse osmosis (RO) plant. A groundwater collection area has been established and is hydraulically bounded by a sub-gradient perimeter of injection and infiltration systems comprising groundwater wells and infiltration lines (NRC, 2007b). The RO plant has operated at the site since late 1999 to augment groundwater clean-up activities. A series of collection wells is used to collect the contaminated water, which is pumped to the RO plant for treatment or, alternatively, pumped to a series of evaporation ponds.

HMC seeks NRC approval to increase its evaporator storage capacity to increase the rate of groundwater restoration by constructing a third evaporation pond (EP3). To construct EP3, an amendment to the NRC License SUA–1471 is required. The amendment request addresses the construction of EP3 and site boundary expansion associated with locating EP3 north of the mill tailings impoundment and north of County Road 63. The site is regulated by the NRC pursuant to the requirements of title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 40 (10 CFR part 40), “Domestic Licensing of Source Material.” The EA was prepared in accordance with NRC requirements in 10 CFR 51 and with the associated guidance in NRC report NUREG–1748, “Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs.” The EA assesses the likely impacts to the environment from HMC’s proposal to expand the current licensed boundary and to construct EP3 for groundwater reclamation.

1.2 The Proposed Action (Alternative B) 1

The proposed action is to amend Source Material License SUA–1471 to permit the expansion of the permitted operations boundary and to permit construction of EP3 for groundwater reclamation activities. The NRC-licensed boundary would be expanded by approximately 185 acres (HMC, 2006b).

The proposed amendment to SUA–1471 would allow HMC to construct EP3 on HMC property north of the large tailings impoundment at a location in sections 22 and 23, approximately 1,800 feet north of County Road 63. A 50-foot wide access corridor would be constructed to access the proposed pond and to locate piping and associated infrastructures to the proposed pond area. The proposed area of impact for EP3 is approximately 33 acres, including the service corridor and earthen containment dike. The evaporative surface area of the proposed pond is approximately 26.5 acres. The pond would be constructed as an at-grade facility, with cut and fill designed to be in rough balance. Therefore, no significant quantities of soil would be imported or exported from the site. The pond would have a double High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) liner with a leak detection/collection system. After groundwater remediation is complete, the pond would be removed and the area reclaimed (HMC, 2006b).

1 Alternatives are analyzed in the EA in the order that they are addressed in the HMC Environmental Report (Bridges and Meyer, 2007) for consistency. Alternative A is the No Action Alternative, Alternative B is the Proposed Action, and Alternatives C and D are alternate evaporative pond locations.