

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](mailto: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,