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.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

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.

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:

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 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),