UL 2106 Field Erected Boiler Assemblies
UL 2157 Electric Clothes Washing Machines and Extractors
UL 2158 Electric Clothes Dryers
UL 2161 Neon Transformers and Power Supplies
UL 2250 Instrumentation Tray Cable
FMRC 3600 Electrical Equipment for Use in Hazardous (Classified) Locations, General Requirements [1]
FMRC 3610 Intrinsically Safe Apparatus and Associated Apparatus for Use in Class I, II and III, Division 1 Hazardous (Classified) Locations [1]
FMRC 3611 Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I, Division 2; Class II, Division 2; and Class III, Division 1 and 2 Hazardous Locations [1]
FMRC 3615 Explosionproof Electrical Equipment, General Requirements
UL 8730–2–3 Automatic Electrical Controls for Household and Similar Use; Part 2: Particular Requirements for Thermal Motor Protectors for Ballasts for Tubular Fluorescent Lamps
Testing and certification of products under this test standard is limited to Class I locations. See also general note and limitation for hazardous location testing.[1]
These standards are approved for equipment or materials intended for use in commercial and industrial power system applications. These standards are not approved for equipment or materials intended for use in installations that are excluded by the provisions of Subpart S in 29 CFR 1910, in particular Section 1910.302(b)(2).[2]

Note 1: All safety testing for Class I locations is limited to recognized ITSNA sites properly pre-qualified by ITSNA. Also see general limitation on intrinsic testing below.

Note 2: Testing and certification of gas operated equipment is limited to equipment for use with ''liquefied petroleum gas.''

The designations and titles of the above test standards were current at the time of the preparation of this current notice.

Many of the above test standards 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 (*e.g.,* UL 22) for some of these standards, as opposed to the ANSI designation (*e.g.,* ANSI/UL 22). Under our procedures, an 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, regardless of whether it is currently recognized for the proprietary or ANSI version. Contact ANSI or the ANSI web site to find out whether or not a standard is currently ANSI approved.

As previously noted, the NRTL Program staff recommended certain limitations on intrinsic testing, which is partly described in the note and footnote above and more fully below. These limitations will apply to the recognition of all test standards that involve intrinsic testing and for which ITSNA is recognized.

ITSNA may perform safety testing for hazardous location products only at the specific ITSNA sites that OSHA has recognized, and that have been pre-qualified by the ITSNA Chief Engineer. In addition, all safety test reports for hazardous location products must undergo a documented review and approval at the Cortland testing facility by a test engineer qualified in hazardous location safety testing, prior to ITSNA's initial or continued authorization of the certifications covered by these reports. All the above limitations apply solely to ITSNA's operations as an NRTL.

Conditions

ITSNA must also abide by the following conditions of the recognition, in addition to those already required by 29 CFR 1910.7:

ITSNA may not test and certify any products for a client that is a manufacturer or vendor, and that is either owned in excess of 2% by ITSLtd, or affiliated organizationally with ITSNA, including Compliance Design.

OSHA must be allowed access to ITSNA's facility and records for purposes of ascertaining continuing compliance with the terms of its recognition and to investigate as OSHA deems necessary;

If ITSNA has reason to doubt the efficacy of any test standard it is using under this program, it must promptly inform the test standard developing organization of this fact and provide that organization with appropriate relevant information upon which its concerns are based;

ITSNA must not engage in or permit others to engage in any misrepresentation of the scope or conditions of its recognition. As part of this condition, ITSNA agrees that it will allow no representation that it is either a recognized or an accredited Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL) without clearly indicating the specific equipment or material to which this recognition is tied, or that its recognition is limited to certain products;

ITSNA must inform OSHA as soon as possible, in writing, of any change of ownership, facilities, or key personnel, and of any major changes in its operations as an NRTL, including details;

ITSNA will meet all the terms of its recognition and will always comply with all OSHA policies pertaining to this recognition;

ITSNA will continue to meet the requirements for recognition in all areas where it has been recognized; and

ITSNA will always cooperate with OSHA to assure compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of its recognition and 29 CFR 1910.7.

Signed at Washington, DC this 20 day of November, 2000.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–30412 Filed 11–28–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

''Reconstruction of the American Canal Project,'' Located in El Paso, Texas; Notice of Draft Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

ACTION: Notice of draft Finding of No Significant Impact for a draft Environmental Assessment.

SUMMARY: Based on a draft environmental assessment (EA), the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC), finds that the proposed action of reconstruction of the existing American Canal is not a major federal action that would have a significant adverse effect on the quality of the human environment. An environmental impact statement will not be prepared for the project unless additional information which may affect this decision is brought to the attention of the USIBWC within thirty (30) days of the date of this Notice. The draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and draft EA have been forwarded to the United States Environmental Protection Agency and various Federal, State and local agencies and interested parties. The draft FONSI and EA are also available at the reference desk at University of Texas At El Paso Library and El Paso Main Library, and on the USIBWC Home Page at http://www.ibwc.state.gov under ''What's New.'' A limited number of copies of these documents are available

for review and comment upon request from USIBWC at the following address: Ms. Sylvia Waggoner, Division Engineer, USIBWC, 4171 North Mesa Street, C–310, El Paso, TX 79902. Telephone: (915) 832–4740, e-mail: sylviawaggoner@ibwc.state.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Action

The proposed rehabilitation and enlargement of the 1.98-mile-long American Canal (also known as Reach F of the Rio Grande American Canal Extension or RGACE) involves demolishing the deteriorating concrete open channel segments of the canal and replacing them with reinforced concrete-lined canal segments. The USIBWC is authorized under the Rio Grande American Canal Extension Act of 1990 (the Act of 1990), Public Law 101–438, dated October 15, 1990, to construct, operate, and maintain an extension of the existing American Canal in El Paso, Texas; which ''would provide for a more equitable distribution of waters between the United States and Mexico, reduce water losses, and minimize many hazards to public safety.''

Water for both irrigation and domestic use in El Paso County is diverted into the American Canal at the American Dam located on the Rio Grande approximately 3 miles upstream from downtown El Paso. The American Dam and American Canal were constructed from 1937 to 1938, within United States territory to divert United States waters away from the Rio Grande, and to allow into the international reach of the Rio Grande only those waters assigned to the United Mexican States under the Convention of 1906. This ensured that United States waters diverted at the American Dam would be completely retained within the United States.

In the Act of 1990, the United States Congress also authorized the negotiation of international agreements for the RGACE to convey Mexican waters authorized under the 1906 Convention. In view of the conveyance water losses and the safety issues inherent in Mexico's existing canal system, the RGACE was designed to accommodate Mexico's annual 60,000 acre-foot allotment of water at 335 cubic feet per second (cfs), should Mexico request its allotment delivered at this location.

Alternatives Considered

Five alternatives, including the Open Channel Alternative (the Proposed Action Alternative) and the No Action Alternative, were considered during the preparation of the environmental assessment. All four action alternatives include (1) increasing the canal capacity to 1535 cfs, (2) demolition of existing canal structures and open channel concrete lining, (3) reconstructing and enlarging the 400-foot open channel segment immediately downstream from the headgates and the 100-foot open channel segment upstream from the gaging station, (4) not repairing or replacing the two closed conduit segments under West Paisano Drive, (5) installing fences to minimize entrance into the canal, (6) installing safety equipment to reduce canal drownings, (7) removing the Smelter Bridge and the abutments of Hart's Mill Bridge, and (8) providing mitigation of the loss of the Smelter Bridge by preparing Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Level III documentation of the structure (including existing and original construction drawings, captioned photographs, and written data). The alternatives are summarized below:

Alternative 1—Closed Conduit Alternative: All existing open channel segments (Upper, Middle, and Lower) between the American Dam and International Dam would be replaced with closed conduits, with the two excepted open reaches in the Upper Open Channel segment. This Alternative would be the most expensive to construct and would lose the historic open visual character of the canal.

Alternative 2—Closed Conduit/Open Channel Alternative A: The Middle Open Channel segment would be replaced with a closed conduit. The Upper and Lower Open Channel segments would be reconstructed and enlarged. This alternative would accomplish all the objectives, but would lose the historic open visual character of the canal in the segment most visible to the public. It would likely triple the number of pedestrian traffic fatalities on nearby highways.

Alternative 3—Closed Conduit/Open Channel Alternative B: The Middle and Lower Open Channel segments would be replaced with closed conduits. The Upper Open Channel segment would be reconstructed and enlarged. This alternative would accomplish all the objectives, but at a cost second highest among the action alternatives. It would also likely triple the number of pedestrian traffic deaths on nearby highways.

Alternative 4—Open Channel Alternative (the Proposed Action Alternative): The Upper, Middle, and Lower Open Channel segments would be reconstructed and enlarged. This Alternative would accomplish all the necessary objectives at the lowest construction cost. It would result in the lowest number of pedestrian traffic fatalities on nearby highways. Though the original canal lining would be replaced, this Alternative would preserve the visual open character of the canal.

Alternative 5—No Action Alternative: The three open channel segments would be left untouched, with no replacements, enlargements, or repairs of any canal segments. While this alternative preserves intact the historic Smelter Bridge, it does not accomplish any of the stated objectives. The annual number of drownings in the Canal would not be reduced. Without reconstruction or major repair of the canal, a serious canal failure is likely within the next five years, especially during the peak irrigation period with the highest canal flow. Such a canal failure would likely close the American Canal for at least one month during costly emergency repairs. If the canal flow was disrupted due to a month of repairs, the El Paso Water Utilities production of potable water would be reduced by 80 to 120 million gallons per day, and over a thousand El Paso County farmers could lose their crops, likely resulting in up to 500 bankruptcies. The No Action Alternative is not considered to be a viable alternative.

Environmental Assessment (EA)

The USIBWC completed the Draft EA for the proposed action on August 22, 2000. The Draft EA is available for review and comment at the previously-cited address.

The Draft EA finds that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action that would cause a significant local, regional, or national adverse impact on the environment, because the Proposed Action Alternative would:

1. Improve structural stability of the American Canal, ensuring an uninterrupted flow of allotted water from the Rio Grande to El Paso County farms and to existing and planned El Paso Water Utilities water treatment facilities.

2. Minimize seepage loss through the cracks in the canal lining;

3. Provide the full design capacity (1535 cfs) influent into the RGACE;

4. Improve safety and reduce the risk of accidental drownings in the American Canal by installing fences and safety equipment;

5. Preserve the historical open channel character of the Canal, and

6. Preserve historical and photographic documentation of the

historic Smelter Bridge per HAER Level III Standard.

Based on the Draft Environmental Assessment and the implementation of the proposed historical mitigation, it has been determined that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and an environmental impact statement is not warranted.

Dated: October 26, 2000.

William A. Wilcox, Jr.,

Attorney-Advisor (General).

[FR Doc. 00–30079 Filed 11–28–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7010–01–P

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

United States and Mexico

Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement for the El Paso-Las Cruces Regional Sustainable Water Project Sierra and Dona Ana Counties, New Mexico and El Paso County, Texas

AGENCY: United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

ACTION: Notice of availability of final environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) in conjunction with the El Paso Water Utilities/Public Service Board has prepared a final environmental impact statement (FEIS) on the El Paso-Las Cruces Regional Sustainable Water Project in Sierra and Dona Ana counties, New Mexico and El Paso County, Texas as proposed by the New Mexico-Texas Water Commission. The FEIS analyzes the no action alternative and the impacts of five action alternatives from construction and operation of the project. No final decision can be made on this proposal during the 30 days following the filing of this FEIS, in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, 40 CFR 1506.10(b)(2).

ADDRESSES: The FEIS may be inspected by appointment during normal business hours at: El Paso Water Utilities, 1154 Hawkins Boulevard, El Paso, Texas; and United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, 4171 North Mesa Street, Suite C–315, El Paso, Texas. Public libraries that have the FEIS available for review are: Branigan Memorial Library, 200 East Picacho Avenue, Las Cruces, New Mexico; El Paso Public Library, 501 North Oregon Street, El Paso, Texas; New Mexico State University Library, Las Cruces, New Mexico; and University Library, The University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Douglas Echlin, Environmental Protection Specialist, Environmental Management Division, USIBWC, 4171 North Mesa Street, C–310, El Paso, Texas 79902 or call 915/832–4741. E-mail: dougechlin@ibwc.state.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The New Mexico-Texas Water Commission, established in 1991 to help meet the water resource challenges of the region, proposed the El Paso-Las Cruces Regional Sustainable Water Project to secure future drinking water supplies from surface sources for the El Paso-Las Cruces region. The project includes the acquisition, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of a drinking water supply, and upgrading or constructing facilities for water conveyance, treatment, distribution, and aquifer storage and recovery. These activities comprise the following three project purposes to provide a year-round drinking water supply from the Rio Grande Project that is of sufficient quantity and quality to meet the anticipated municipal needs of Hatch, Las Cruces, northern and southern Dona Ana County, New Mexico and El Paso, Texas; to protect and maintain the sustainability of the Mesilla Bolson (ground water basin or aquifer); and to extend the longevity of the Hueco Bolson.

Project alternatives presented in this FEIS were designed to achieve these three project purposes. In addition, the project will strive to provide high quality water needed to achieve successful treatment and to meet federal drinking water standards; to deliver water efficiently and promote water conservation; and provide overall benefits to the riverine ecosystem, particularly aquatic and riparian habitats.

The project recognizes and accepts existing institutional and social constraints, including continuing to meet treaty, compact, and contract requirements for delivery of Rio Grande Project waters. The project would not adversely affect the quantity and quality of water deliveries to agricultural users; impose new responsibilities on state or federal governments; or preclude other opportunities to enhance the Rio Grande ecosystem. The need for this project is based on the region's future drinking water supply requirements. The project is necessary to avoid both potentially permanent impacts on the Mesilla and Hueco Bolsons and critical drinking water shortages in the El Paso-Las Cruces region. Population growth rates have increased sharply, increasing the demand for drinking water. It is projected that the Texas portion of the Hueco Bolson will be exhausted of all fresh water by the year 2025 because water is being pumped from the aquifer faster than it can be naturally replenished. If additional surface waters are not made available to supplement the drinking water supply, water shortages in the region will likely lead to severe health and sanitation problems.

Copies of the FEIS have been sent to agencies, organizations and individuals who participated in the scoping process and to those who have requested copies of the FEIS. A limited number of the FEIS may be obtained upon request from the contact person identified above. A Record of Decision will be prepared on this proposal after a minimum of 30 days following the filing of the FEIS. Any comments on the Final EIS must be received no later than 30 days after the date of publication of the notice of availability by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the **Federal Register**. No action will be taken on the proposed action before 30 days following publication of the notice of availability of the EIS by EPA.

Dated: November 17, 2000.

William A. Wilcox, Jr.,

Legal Advisor.

[FR Doc. 00–30224 Filed 11–28–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–03–U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel; Meeting Notice

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. 94–463, Stat. 770–776) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), on October 2, 2000, announced the establishment of the Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel (IIEP). The IIEP functions as a cross-disciplinary oversight group to independently monitor and evaluate the results of the first year of implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). A Charter governing the IIEP functions as a Federal Advisory Committee was filed with Congress on October 17, 2000, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration. The IIEP will