

activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Advanced Media Workflow Association, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 28, 2000, Advanced Media Workflow Association, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 29, 2000 (65 FR 40127).

The last notification was filed with the Department on June 27, 2008. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on July 31, 2008 (73 FR 44773).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. E8-24286 Filed 10-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-63,719]

#### 3M Precision Optics, Inc., Cincinnati, OH; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated September 18, 2008, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on September 3, 2008. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 18, 2008 (73 FR 54174).

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that imports of optical systems for projection televisions and projectors did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioners provided additional information pertaining to the customers of the subject firm and alleged that imports of projection televisions and projectors increased.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record and has

determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of October 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-25072 Filed 10-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-63,910]

#### Magna Services of America, Inc., Magna Aftermarket, Inc., a Subsidiary of Magna International, Greenville, MI; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked September 26, 2008, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on September 3, 2008. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 18, 2008 (73 FR 54174).

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that imports of outdoor home speakers and lights did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioners provided additional information pertaining to the foreign facilities of the subject firm and alleged a shift in production of outdoor home speakers and lights by the subject firm to Canada.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record and has determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the

eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of October 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-25071 Filed 10-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under Section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to Section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than November 3, 2008.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than November 3, 2008.

The petitions filed in this case are available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S.

Department of Labor, Room C-5311, 200  
Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington,  
DC 20210.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of  
October 2008.

**Erin FitzGerald,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment  
Assistance.*

**APPENDIX**

**TAA PETITIONS INSTITUTED BETWEEN 10/6/08 AND 10/10/08**

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
64165	Adrian Fabricators, Inc. (Comp)	Adrian, MI	10/06/08	10/01/08
64166	Best Foam (Wkrs)	Sherman, MS	10/06/08	10/02/08
64167	Sanmina-SCI USA, Inc. (State)	Costa Mesa, CA	10/06/08	10/02/08
64168	Dynamic Cooking Systems, Inc. (Comp)	Huntington Beach, CA	10/06/08	09/26/08
64169	Fisher and Paykel Appliances, Inc. (Comp)	Huntington Beach, CA	10/06/08	10/02/08
64170	Pretty Products, LLC (Comp)	Mt. Pleasant, TN	10/06/08	09/30/08
64171	Wheeling Brake Band Friction Mfg. (Wkrs)	Glen Dale, WV	10/06/08	10/03/08
64172	Zippo Manufacturing Company (Comp)	Bradford, PA	10/06/08	10/03/08
64173	Ellen Tracy (Wkrs)	New York, NY	10/06/08	10/01/08
64174	Loewenstein/Brown Jordan International (Wkrs)	Greensboro, NC	10/07/08	06/06/08
64175	Hanley Wood, LLC (Comp)	Chicago, IL	10/07/08	10/06/08
64176	Leggett and Platt (Comp)	Cerritos, CA	10/07/08	10/06/08
64177	Louis Hornick & Company, Inc. (Wkrs)	Haverstraw, NY	10/07/08	09/26/08
64178	Elbeco Incorporated/City Shirt Company (Comp)	Frackville, PA	10/07/08	10/06/08
64179	Elbeco Incorporated/Galion Manufacturing Co. (Comp)	Galion, OH	10/07/08	10/06/08
64180	Conestoga Wood Specialties Corp (Wkrs)	Beavertown, PA	10/07/08	09/26/08
64181	Autoliv (Comp)	Columbia City, IN	10/07/08	06/06/08
64182	Fairmont Dairy LLC (Comp)	Belleville, PA	10/08/08	09/25/08
64183	Prairie Wood Products (State)	Prairie City, OR	10/08/08	10/01/08
64184	Protient, Inc. (State)	Norfolk, NE	10/08/08	10/07/08
64185	PL Subsidiary, Inc. (Comp)	Charlotte, NC	10/08/08	10/07/08
64186	American Polymer, Inc. (Wkrs)	Oxford, MA	10/08/08	10/06/08
64187	Coupled Products LLC (Comp)	Columbia City, IN	10/08/08	10/07/08
64188	Winston Furniture (State)	Haleyville, AL	10/08/08	10/06/08
64189	Dura Automotive (Wkrs)	Lawrenceburg, TN	10/08/08	09/16/08
64190	Hafner USA (State)	New York, NY	10/08/08	10/03/08
64191	Bill Sills Sportswear, Inc. (Comp)	Huntingdon, TN	10/09/08	10/06/08
64192	Freudenberg-NOK (Comp)	Scottsburg, IN	10/09/08	10/08/08
64193	American Velvet Company (State)	Stonington, CT	10/09/08	10/08/08
64194	Formica Corporation (IUCWA)	Evendale, OH	10/09/08	10/08/08
64195	Enefco (State)	Auburn, ME	10/09/08	10/08/08
64196	Martinrea Heavy Stamping (Wkrs)	Shelbyville, KY	10/09/08	10/08/08
64197	Avid Medical Products (Comp)	Santa Ana, CA	10/10/08	10/09/08
64198	Cranston Print Works Company (Comp)	Webster, MA	10/10/08	10/09/08
64199	Cable Consultants, Inc. (Wkrs)	Corvallis, OR	10/10/08	09/29/08
64200	Bridgestone Firestone Diversified Products (Comp)	Noblesville, IN	10/10/08	10/09/08
64201	Order Acquisition (Comp)	Santa Clara, CA	10/10/08	10/09/08
64202	Barco, Inc. (Wkrs)	Xenia, OH	10/10/08	10/09/08
64203	Gates Rubber Company (State)	Siloam Springs, AR	10/10/08	10/09/08
64204	CMA Actuation Products (Wkrs)	Philipsburg, PA	10/10/08	10/09/08
64205	The Ohio Heart and Vascular Center (Wkrs)	Cincinnati, OH	10/10/08	10/08/08
64206	Hutchinson FTS, Inc. (State)	Reading, MI	10/10/08	10/09/08
64207	Delphi Electronics and Safety (Wkrs)	Vandalia, OH	10/10/08	09/24/08
64208	Anchor Glass Container (UAW)	Zanesville, OH	10/10/08	09/25/08
64209	Federal Screw Works (State)	Big Rapids, MI	10/10/08	10/09/08

[FR Doc. E8-25070 Filed 10-21-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-282-LR and 50-306-LR; ASLBP No. 08-871-01-LR]

### Atomic Safety and Licensing Board; Northern States Power Co. (Formerly Nuclear Management Company, LLC.) (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2); Notice and Order (Scheduling Oral Argument)

October 16, 2008.

**Before Administrative Judges: William J. Froehlich, Chairman; Dr. Gary S. Arnold; Dr. Thomas J. Hiron**

Oral argument will be heard on standing and contention admissibility issues presented in the hearing request received on August 18, 2008, from the Prairie Island Indian Community (Petitioner).<sup>1</sup> This proceeding arises from an application filed on April 11, 2008, by Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC)<sup>2</sup> for renewal of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-42 and DPR-60 for an additional 20 years of operation at the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PINGP).<sup>3</sup> PINGP is located near the City of Red Wing, Minnesota, on the west bank of the Mississippi River.

The participants are advised of the following information regarding the scheduling of the oral argument:

*Date:* Wednesday, October 29, 2008.

*Time:* 9 a.m. Central Time (CT).

*Location:* Dakota County Judicial Center—Courtroom 2E, 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033.

The format of oral argument, including the allocation of time to the various participants, will be determined at the outset of the session. Generally, the Board asks that the Parties refrain from simply rehashing the content of their pleadings. Rather, the Board wishes to further explore with the

<sup>1</sup> In response to a June 17, 2008, notice of opportunity for hearing published in the **Federal Register** (73 FR 34335), Petitioner timely filed a request for hearing and a petition to intervene in accordance with 10 CFR 2.309.

<sup>2</sup> The NRC has approved the transfer of operating authority over Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, from Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC) to Northern States Power Company (Northern States). See Order Approving Transfer of License and Conforming Amendment (September 15, 2008), at 3 (ADAMS Accession No. ML082521182).

<sup>3</sup> The operating licenses for PINGP, Units 1 and 2, expire on August 9, 2013, and October 29, 2014, respectively. The April 11, 2008, application for renewal was supplemented by a letter dated May 16, 2008.

Parties the positions they took in their written submissions. The oral argument will serve principally to assist the Board in the discharge of its decisional responsibilities regarding the admissibility of the Petitioner's proffered contentions. At the same time, however, it should provide counsel with a valuable opportunity to clarify for the Board those issues to be addressed.

The Board has identified 12 specific issues it wishes the Parties to address at oral argument. Counsel should arrive fully prepared to discuss each topic that is a matter of concern to his or her client(s). While the following list does not purport to include all issues that may arise, it should help to guide the Parties in their preparation.

(1) Does the NRC Staff still challenge Mr. Mahowald's representation, in light of the Petitioner's September 19, 2008, Reply at footnote 1 and Mahowald Declaration II?

(2) As to Contention 1, what does the Petitioner allege to be lacking from Applicant's Environmental Report (ER)? Provide citations to any cases, regulations, or statutes which spell out the requirements.

(3) As to Contention 2, Applicant, Petitioner, and Staff should be prepared to argue whether and to what extent the MACCS2 code is applicable to the severe accident mitigation analysis (SAMA) or the license extension. Applicant should be prepared to address "user inputs" to the code. The Board wishes to explore the extent to which the calculation that converts level of contamination to decontamination cost is controlled by user input.

(4) As to Contention 3, Applicant, Petitioner, and Staff should be prepared to discuss the level of detail with which Applicant must analyze impacts on endangered species in the ER. Parties should provide legal support for their positions.

(5) As to Contention 4, Applicant, Petitioner, and Staff should be prepared to address whether any "special circumstances" exist that would make the NRC's category 1 finding inapplicable. Petitioner should discuss the necessity to request a waiver in this case.

(6) As to Contention 5, Applicant should be prepared to discuss the demographics analysis in the ER and whether the Indian Community was specifically included. All Parties should be prepared to identify any requirements for addressing environmental justice in the ER that Applicant has not met.

(7) As to Contention 6, Applicant, Petitioner, and Staff should be prepared

to address whether or not the "coatings issues" are addressed as part of the Current Licensing Basis (CLB). Petitioner should be prepared to address any plant specific data relied upon to support this contention.

(8) As to Contention 7, Applicant should be prepared to explain how the surveillance capsules are used. Applicant should also be prepared to address the current vessel surveillance plan and the proposed enhancements. If the proposed changes are significant, when would interested parties have a chance to review them? Petitioner's contention alleges that vessel internals are subject to embrittlement, that embrittlement could cause internals to fail during a loss-of-coolant accident, and that such a failure could lead to an uncoolable core geometry. Petitioner should be able to articulate the facts or expert opinion within the original contention supporting each one of these links.

(9) As to Contention 8, Petitioner should be prepared to address whether the "stress corrosion cracking" issue is addressed as part of the CLB. All Parties should be prepared to address the generic question: If an issue is subject to an Aging Management Plan (AMP) during the current license period, is it required to be addressed by an AMP as a part of relicensing?

(10) As to Contention 9, Petitioner should be prepared to identify what piping system(s) it is referring to and what safety-related function(s) those systems play. The Applicant should be prepared to explain the extent to which the Prairie Island facility has buried piping, what types of systems utilize these buried pipes, and which pipes, if any, are within the scope of license renewal.

(11) As to Contention 10, Petitioner will be asked if it has withdrawn this contention based on the statements in its Reply of September 19 at page 24.

(12) The oral argument will conclude with summary statements by the Parties on the pending motion to strike filed by Applicant on September 29, 2008, the NRC Staff's Response of October 9, 2008, and the Petitioner's Answer filed on October 10, 2008.

As an informational matter, the participants are advised that current planning calls for the proceeding to be made available for live viewing via the following Internet Web streaming feed: Prairie Island Oral Argument.

Please be advised that this Web stream will be available for viewing for 90 days after or until Tuesday, January 27, 2009.

It is so ordered.