

that the workers' firm did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act and that the workers did not provide services in direct support of an affiliated TAA certified firm.

On May 14, 2004, the Department filed its second consent motion for voluntary remand. The Department issued a negative determination on remand on August 2, 2004. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on August 10, 2004 (69 FR 48527). The determination was based on findings that the workers at the subject facility did not produce or support the production of an article by IBM and were not under the control of BP. On December 2, 2005, the USCIT remanded the matter to the Department.

On February 6, 2006, the Department issued a second negative determination on remand. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on March 2, 2006 (71 FR 10709). The Department's determination was based on findings that the criteria developed by the Department to determine the extent to which a worker group engaged in activities related to the production of an article by a producing firm was under the control of the producing firm had not been met. On March 30, 2007, the USCIT remanded the matter to the Department.

The Department has determined after further review that during the relevant period, a significant number or proportion of the subject worker group was separated and that the subject worker group was working in support of, and under sufficient control of import impacted BP production facilities, whose workers were certified as eligible for TAA.

Conclusion

Based on review of the record evidence, I determine that BP controlled the subject worker group and that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with crude oil produced by an affiliated facility which the subject worker group supported, contributed to the total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of workers at the subject facility.

In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

"All workers of International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 26, 2002, through two years from the issuance of this revised determination, are eligible to

apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 2nd day of May 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-8825 Filed 5-8-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Safety Defects, Examination, Correction, and Records

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

DATES: Submit comments on or before July 9, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Debbie Ferraro, Management Services Division, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2171, Arlington, VA 22209-3939. Commenters are encouraged to send their comments on a computer disk, or via E-mail to Ferraro.Debbie@dol.gov, along with an original printed copy. Ms. Ferraro can be reached at (202) 693-9821 (voice), or (202) 693-9801 (facsimile).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact the employee listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Title 30 CFR 56.13015 and 57.13015 require that compressed-air receivers and other unfired pressure vessels be inspected by inspectors holding a valid National Board Commission and in accordance with the applicable chapters of the National Board Inspection Code,

a manual for Boiler and Pressure Vessels Inspectors, 1979.

Title 30 CFR 56.13030 and 57.13030 require that fired pressure vessels (boilers) be equipped with safety devices approved by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) to protect against hazards from overpressure, flameouts, fuel interruptions and low water level. Sections 56/57.13030 requires that records of inspections and repairs be retained by the mine operator in accordance with the requirements of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and the National Board Inspection Code (progressive records—no limit on retention time) and made available to the Secretary or his/her authorized representative.

Title 30 CFR 56.14100 and 57.14100 require equipment operators to inspect equipment, machinery, and tools that are to be used during a shift for safety defects before the equipment is placed in operation. Defects affecting safety are required to be corrected in a timely manner. In instances where the defect makes continued operation of the equipment unsafe, the standards require removal from service, tagging to identify that it is out of use, and repair before use is resumed.

Title 30 CFR 56.18002 and 57.18002 require that a competent person designated by the operator shall examine each working place at least once each shift for conditions which may adversely affect safety or health. A record that such examinations were conducted shall be kept by the operator for a period of one year, and shall be made available for review by the Secretary or his/her authorized representative.

II. Desired Focus of Comments

Currently, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to the Safety Defects, Examination, Correction, and Records. MSHA is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the employee listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice, or viewed on the Internet by accessing the MSHA home page (<http://www.msha.gov>) and then choosing "Rules and Regs" and "Federal Register Documents".

III. Current Actions

Inspection records denote any hazards that were discovered and how the hazards or unsafe conditions were abated. Federal inspectors use the records to ensure that unsafe conditions are identified early and corrected.

Currently, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the information collection related to the Safety Defects, Examination, Correction, and Records.

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Safety Defects; Examination, Correction and Records.

OMB Number: 1219-0089.

Number of Respondents: 12,557.

Number of Responses: 11,502,241.

Burden Hours: 1,223,104.

Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): \$0.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated at Arlington, Virginia, this 4th day of May, 2007.

David L. Meyer,

Director, Office of Administration and Management.

[FR Doc. E7-8882 Filed 5-8-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-P

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

May 2, 2007.

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, May 10, 2007.

PLACE: The Richard V. Backley Hearing Room, 9th Floor, 601 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Commission will consider and act upon the following in open session: *Secretary of Labor v. Marfork Coal Co.*, Docket Nos. WEVA 2006-788-R, WEVA 2006-789-R, and WEVA 2006-790-R. (Issues include whether an operator may maintain a contest proceeding under section 105(d) of the Mine Act when it does not seek an expedited hearing.)

Any person attending this meeting who requires special accessibility features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission in advance of those needs. Subject to 29 CFR 2706.150(a)(3) and 2706.160(d).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFO: Jean Ellen (202) 434-9950/(202) 708-9300 for TDD Relay/1-800-877-8339 for toll free.

Jean H. Ellen,

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 07-2321 Filed 5-7-07; 3:19 pm]

BILLING CODE 6735-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee Management Renewal

The NSF management officials having responsibility Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering (#25104) have determined that renewing this group for another two years is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Director, National Science Foundation by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Effective date for renewal is May 23, 2007. For more information contact Susanne Bolton at (703) 292-7488.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. E7-8857 Filed 5-8-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[DOCKET NOS. 50-498 and 50-499]

STP Nuclear Operating Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, numbered NPF-76 and NPF-80, issued to STP Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, respectively, located in Matagorda County, Texas.

The proposed amendment request would change the name of one licensee, Texas Genco, LP (Texas Genco), to NRG South Texas LP. The name change results from purchase of Texas Genco's parent company by NRG Energy, Inc. as approved by the NRC in January 2006.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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. Under 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 amendments 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:

The proposed amendment[s] would only change the name of a licensee. The proposed name change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed name change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed name change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three