

taken off the store shelf, by responding to complaints from product users, and by “recalling” products that they find through such testing or complaints to pose safety concerns).

OSHA has reviewed information and documents pertaining to SDoC and met with ITIC and a few interested parties who provided some input on SDoC and their view of its advantages and disadvantages. Documents we have gathered to date, including the ITIC proposal, are available at the OSHA Docket Office. In general, these documents are available through the OSHA Web site at <http://dockets.osha.gov>.

After reviewing ITIC’s proposal, OSHA has decided that it needs to learn more about SDoC and the assurances behind them. Accordingly, this request is designed to obtain that information.

III. Questions on Which Comment Is Requested

OSHA is seeking information, data, and comment on SDoC generally, and the ITIC proposal specifically. OSHA is providing broad questions below to provide a framework for the public to respond to this RFI. However, you can provide comment or information on any aspect of the broad areas mentioned below and not just limit your answers to the specific questions posed. In responding to these questions, please explain the reasons supporting your views, and identify and provide relevant information on which you rely, including data, studies, articles, and other materials. Respondents are encouraged to address any aspect of the issue on which they believe they can contribute. Please briefly identify your background or qualification on the topic on which you are responding, where relevant.

SDoC Process

Note: Questions 1 through 7 pertain to regulatory or product approval systems that currently allow SDoCs.

1. What quality controls and procedures do equipment manufacturers/suppliers now follow to effectively perform, document, and issue SDoCs for their products?
2. What kinds of problems do product manufacturers and product users now encounter with their SDoCs and how are they resolved or addressed?
3. What kinds of products are now approved or not approved using SDoCs, and why?

4. Is there any reduction in the “time-to-market” for products? If so, how much of a reduction is there, how much is due to improvements in product

safety, and what is the savings in costs to the manufacturer if SDoC is used instead of a third-party approval?

5. Do third-party product certifiers currently use SDoCs in approving products or play a role in issuing SDoCs, and if so how?

6. What kinds of testing and testing capabilities are required for using SDoCs?

7. Have there been any incidents involving “unapproved” IT equipment, or IT equipment approved through SDoC, creating hazards?

SDoC Proposal

8. What has changed with respect to IT equipment in the 17 years since OSHA adopted the NRTL Program that could warrant a reconsideration of the third-party testing criterion?

9. Should OSHA consider allowing SDoC in the approval process for IT equipment, and if so, to what extent? If allowed, what restrictions, safeguards, or other requirements would be necessary to provide employers, employees, and OSHA with equivalent assurances of safety to that currently provided by NRTL testing and certification? Should OSHA require manufacturers performing SDoCs to meet all the requirements of an NRTL except independence? How, specifically, should OSHA evaluate the effects on worker safety of SDoCs versus NRTL approvals?

10. If OSHA were to adopt SDoC, should OSHA limit its use to computers, computer peripherals, and telecommunications equipment only, as suggested by ITIC, or to all IT equipment, as defined by the relevant U.S. test standard, or restrict its use to low voltage (for example, 50 volts or less) IT equipment or components? In the alternative, should OSHA allow its use for other types of equipment? If so, what criteria, requirements, or data should OSHA use to determine the types of products or components eligible for SDoCs? What types of equipment would not be suitable for SDoC?

11. What advantages or benefit would workers, employers, or OSHA derive if OSHA were to allow SDoC? What disadvantages or detriments would result? What other groups or parties would consider it beneficial or damaging, and how?

12. If allowed, should OSHA limit the use of SDoCs to particular kinds of manufacturers and, if so, what would be the selection criteria?

13. If OSHA were to adopt some form of SDoC, what kind of mechanisms would be necessary to ensure effective monitoring of manufacturers and

products, and to handle complaints and product recalls?

14. Are there ways in which OSHA could incorporate the SDoC into its current process of NRTL approvals?

General Comments on SDoCs

OSHA solicits comment on any other related issues or topics that may assist in the evaluation of SDoCs and whether they can be used in a way that maintains or improves the NRTL approval process along with the safety of equipment.

Authority and Signature

This document was prepared under the direction of Jonathan L. Snare, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. It is issued pursuant to sections 4, 6, and 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657), Secretary of Labor’s Order 5–2002 (67 FR 65008), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC this 26th day of October, 2005.

Jonathan L. Snare,

Acting Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05–22630 Filed 11–14–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting of the Board of Directors

TIME AND DATE: The Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation will meet on November 28, 2005 via conference call. The meeting will begin at 12 p.m. (e.s.t.), and continue until conclusion of the Board’s agenda.

LOCATION: 3333 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20007, 3rd Floor Conference Room.

STATUS OF MEETING: OPEN. Directors will participate by telephone conference in such a manner as to enable interested members of the public to hear and identify all persons participating in the meeting. Members of the public may observe the meeting by joining participating staff at the location indicated above.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Approval of the agenda.
2. Consider and act on Board of Directors’ response to the Inspector General’s Semiannual Report to Congress for the period of October 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005.
3. Consider and act on other business.
4. Public comment.

CONTACT PERSON FOR INFORMATION:

Patricia Batie, Manager of Board Operations, at (202) 295–1500.

SPECIAL NEEDS: Upon request, meeting notices will be made available in alternate formats to accommodate visual and hearing impairments. Individuals who have a disability and need an accommodation to attend the meeting may notify Patricia Batie at (202) 295-1500.

Dated: November 9, 2005.

Victor M. Fortuno,

Vice President for Legal Affairs, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05-22659 Filed 11-9-05; 4:29 pm]

BILLING CODE 7050-01-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) announces a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives (ACERA). The committee serves as a deliberative body to advise the Archivist of the United States on technical, mission, and service issues related to the Electronic Records Archives (ERA). This includes, but is not limited to, advising and making recommendations to the Archivist on issues related to the development, implementation, and use of the ERA system.

Date of Meeting: November 30, 2005.

Time of Meeting: 9 a.m.-4 p.m.

Place of Meeting: 700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20408-0001.

This meeting will be open to the public. However, due to space limitations and access procedures, the name and telephone number of individuals planning to attend must be submitted to the Electronic Records Archives Program at era.program@nara.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Agenda

- Committee organization and rules.
- Review of NARA's mission and activities in the electronic records arena.
- Development of a plan of action for the committee.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lewis Bellardo, Deputy Archivist of the

United States/Chief of Staff; (301) 837-1600.

Mary Ann Hadyka,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-22579 Filed 11-14-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463 as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research (DMR) #1203.

Dates and Times: December 8, 2005; 7:45 a.m.-8 p.m. (open: 8:15-11:45, 12:45-3:30, 5-6; closed: 3:30-5, 6-8).

December 9, 2005; 8 a.m.-3 p.m. (open 9-9:45).

Place: Columbia University, New York, NY.

Type of Meeting: Part open.

Contact Person: Dr. Maija M. Kukla, Program Director, Materials Research Science and Engineering Centers, Division of Materials Research, Room 1065, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone (703) 292-4940.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning progress of Materials Research Science and Engineering Center.

Agenda: December 8, 2005—Closed to brief site visit panel.

December 9, 2005—Open for Directors overview of Materials Research Science and Engineering Center and presentations. Closed to review and evaluate progress of Materials Research Science and Engineering Center.

Reason for Closing: The work being reviewed may include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: November 8, 2005.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-22635 Filed 11-14-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

TXU Generation Company, LP; Biweekly Notice; Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses; Correction

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance; Correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice appearing in the **Federal Register** on October 25, 2005 (70 FR 61667), that incorrectly issued Amendment No. 120 for Units 1 and 2. The correct amendment No. is 122. This action is necessary to correct the incorrect amendment numbers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mohan C. Thadani, PM, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulation Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone (301) 415-1476, e-mail: mct@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On page 61667, in the first column, in the first complete notice, sixteenth line, it is corrected to read from "Amendment Nos. 120 and 120" to "Amendment Nos. 122 and 122".

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of November 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mohan C. Thadani,

Senior Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate IV, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E5-6273 Filed 11-14-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-271]

License No. Dpr-28; Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; Notice of Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) has issued a Director's Decision with regard to a Petition dated December 7, 2004, filed pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) section 2.206 by Mr. Raymond Shadis, hereinafter referred to as the "Petitioner." The Petition concerns the operation of the Vermont Yankee