

testing and certification, an NRTL's scope of recognition does not include that product(s).

Many UL test standards also are approved as American National Standards by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). However, for convenience, we use the designation of the standards developing organization for the standard as opposed to the ANSI designation. Under our procedures, any NRTL recognized for an ANSI-approved test standard may use either the latest proprietary version of the test standard or the latest ANSI version of that standard. You may contact ANSI to find out whether or not a test standard is currently ANSI-approved.

Preliminary Finding on the Application

NSF has submitted an acceptable request for expansion of its recognition as an NRTL. In connection with this request, OSHA did not perform an on-site review of NSF's NRTL testing facilities. However, NRTL Program assessment staff reviewed information pertinent to the request and recommended that NSF's recognition be expanded to include the twenty additional test standards listed above (see Exhibit 16-3). Our review of the application file, the assessor's recommendation, and other pertinent documents indicate that NSF can meet the requirements, as prescribed by 29 CFR 1910.7, for the expansion for the twenty additional test standards listed above. This preliminary finding does not constitute an interim or temporary approval of the application.

OSHA welcomes public comments, in sufficient detail, as to whether NSF has met the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.7 for expansion of its recognition as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory. Your comments should consist of pertinent written documents and exhibits. Should you need more time to comment, you must request it in writing, including reasons for the request. OSHA must receive your written request for extension at the address provided above no later than the last date for comments. OSHA will limit any extension to 30 days, unless the requester justifies a longer period. We may deny a request for extension if it is not adequately justified. You may obtain or review copies of NSF's requests, the on-site review report, other pertinent documents, and all submitted comments, as received, by contacting the Docket Office, Room N-2625, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, at the above address. Docket No. NRTL2-98 contains all materials in the record concerning NSF's application.

The NRTL Program staff will review all timely comments and, after resolution of issues raised by these comments, will recommend whether to grant NSF's expansion request. The Assistant Secretary will make the final decision on granting the expansion and, in making this decision, may undertake other proceedings that are prescribed in Appendix A to 29 CFR 1910.7. OSHA will publish a public notice of this final decision in the **Federal Register**.

Signed at Washington, DC this 29th day of March, 2006.

Jonathan L. Snare,

Acting Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-7519 Filed 5-17-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

May 11, 2006.

FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Vol. 71, No. 84, at 25860, May 2, 2006.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, May 18, 2006.

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

STATUS: Open.

CHANGE IN MEETING: The Commission has postponed the meeting to consider and act upon *Secretary of Labor v.*

Cumberland Coal Resources, LP, Docket Nos. PENN 2004-73-R, PENN 2004-74-R, 2004-75-R, PENN 2004-85-R, PENN 2004-86-R, PENN 2004-87-R, PENN 2004-88-R, PENN 2004-104-R, PENN 2004-105-R, PENN 2004-181, and PENN 2005-8. No earlier announcement of the change in meeting was possible.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: 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. 06-4676 Filed 5-16-06; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 6735-01-M

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE: May 11, 2006.

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, May 25, 2006.

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. Cumberland Coal Resources, LP*, Docket Nos. PENN 2004-73-R, PENN 2004-74-R, PENN 2004-75-R, PENN 2004-85-R, PENN 2004-86-R, PENN 2004-87-R, PENN 2004-88-R, PENN 2004-104-R, PENN 2004-105-R, PENN 2004-181, and PENN 2005-8. (Issues include whether substantial evidence supports the judge's findings that Cumberland violated 30 CFR 75.334(b)(1) on three occasions because its bleeder system failed to effectively dilute and carry away methane; whether substantial evidence supports the judge's finding that Cumberland had notice that its bleeder system violated 30 CFR 75.334(b)(1); and whether the judge correctly found that MSHA acted within its discretion in issuing imminent danger withdrawal orders on two occasions.)

The Commission heard oral argument in this matter on May 11, 2006.

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).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: 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. 06-4680 Filed 5-16-06; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 6735-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-416]

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Entergy Mississippi, Inc., Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Entergy Operations, Inc., et al. (the licensee) to withdraw its application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-29 for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, located in Claiborne County, Mississippi, dated June 27, 2005.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Facility Operating License to change Technical Specification 3.6.1.3, Required Actions A.1 and B.1, to add closed relief valves as acceptable isolation devices provided that the relief setpoint is greater than 1.5 times containment design pressure.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, published in the **Federal Register** on August 30, 2005 (70 FR 51381). However, by letter dated May 5, 2006, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 27, 2005, and the licensee's letter dated May 5, 2006, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>.

Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to pdrc@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of May 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bhalchandra Vaidya,

*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. E6-7573 Filed 5-17-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-266, 50-301, 50-282, and 50-306]

Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2; Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of exemptions from Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), section 50.71(e)(4), for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24, DPR-

27, DPR-42, and DPR-60, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC, the licensee), for operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP), Units 1 and 2, located in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin, and the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant (PINGP), Units 1 and 2, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed actions would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the updated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The updated FSAR at PINGP is called the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR). Under the proposed exemptions, the licensee would submit updates to the updated FSARs once per fuel cycle, within 6 months following completion of each PBNP, Unit 1, refueling outage and within 6 months of each PINGP, Unit 2, refueling outage, respectively, not to exceed 24 months from the last submittal for either site. PBNP and PINGP are two-unit sites, each site sharing a common updated FSAR.

The proposed actions are in accordance with the licensee's application dated October 12, 2005.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Section 50.71(e)(4) requires licensees to submit updates to their FSARs annually or within 6 months after each refueling outage provided that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since the units for each site share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document annually or within 6 months after a refueling outage for each unit. The underlying purpose of the rule was to relieve licensees of the burden of filing annual FSAR revisions while ensuring that such revisions are made at least every 24 months. The NRC reduced the burden, in part, by permitting a licensee to submit its FSAR revisions 6 months after refueling outages for its facility, but it did not provide in the rule for multiple-unit facilities sharing a common FSAR. Rather, the NRC stated, "[w]ith respect to the concern about multiple facilities sharing a common FSAR, licensees will have maximum flexibility for scheduling updates on a case-by-case basis" (57 FR 39355). Allowing the exemptions would keep the updated FSARs current within 24 months of the

last revision, while reducing the burden on the licensee.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed actions and concludes that they involve administrative activities unrelated to plant operation, and therefore there would be no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

The proposed actions will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site.

There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released off site. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed actions do not have a potential to affect any historic sites. They do not affect non-radiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed actions (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed actions and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

The proposed actions do not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for PBNP, dated May 1972; in NUREG-1437, Supplement 23, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants [regarding PBNP]," dated August 2005; and in the Final Environmental Statement for PINGP, dated May 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Wisconsin State official, Mr. J. Kitsemel of the Public Service Commission, on April