

Services Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 4034, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536. Additionally, comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time may also be directed to Mr. Richard A. Sloan.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Patrick Henry Building, 601 D Street, NW., Ste. 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 23, 2002.

**Richard A. Sloan,**

*Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.*

[FR Doc. 02-13601 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Justice Programs

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice of information collection under review: reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired; accounting system and financial capability questionnaire.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Program, has submitted the following information collection request of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for "sixty days" until July 29, 2002. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Cynthia J. Schwimer, Comptroller (202) 307-0623, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected

agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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 submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Reinstatement, With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval has Expired.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire.

(3) *Agency from number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: Form Number:* OJP Form 7120/1. Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as brief abstract:* Primary: Not-for-profit institutions. Other: For-profit institutions. This form will be completed by applicants that are newly-formed firms or established firms with no previous grants awarded by the Office of Justice Programs. It is used as an aide to determine those applicants/grantees that may require special attention in matters relating to the accountability of Federal funds. This information is required for assessing the financial risk of a potential recipient in administering federal funds in accordance with OMB Circular A-110 and 28 CFR part 70.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 100 respondents will complete a 4-hour form.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the*

*collection:* There are an estimated 400 annual total burden hours associated with this collection.

*If additional information is required contact:* Brenda E. Dyer, Department Deputy Clearance Officer, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 24, 2002.

**Brenda E. Dyer,**

*Department Deputy Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 02-13602 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,659 and NAFTA-05058]

#### Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of March 6, 2002, the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, AFL-CIO-CLC, Local 6-0111 requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) under petition TA-W-39,659 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) under petition NAFTA-05058. The TAA and NAFTA-TAA denial notices applicable to workers of Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, Michigan, were signed on February 13, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 28, 2002 (67 FR 9326 & 9327, respectively).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, Michigan engaged in

employment related to the production of metal stamping for the automobile industry, was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed that none of the respondents imported products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced during the relevant period.

The NAFTA-TAA petition for the same worker group was denied because criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) of section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their imports of products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import from Canada or Mexico products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced, nor was the subject plant's production shifted from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioner alleges that the Dodge pickup inner box panel jobs that left the plant in mid 2001 went to the Chrysler plant in Saltillo, Mexico.

Review of the initial investigation and data supplied by the respondents during the corresponding survey indicate that the customer of the Dodge pickup inner box panel ceased purchasing the product from the subject firm during July 2001, in favor of purchasing the product from other domestic sources.

Further review of the findings in the initial decision, indicate that the company did not shift production of Dodge pickup inner box panels to Mexico or Canada, nor did they import the panels from Mexico or Canada during the relevant period.

### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of May, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-13539 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,967]

#### **Bethlehem Steel Corp., Lackawanna Coke Division, Lackawanna, NY; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application of January 23, 2002, the United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice was signed on December 11, 2001 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 26, 2001 (66 FR 66426).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

- (1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;
- (2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or
- (3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Lackawanna Coke Division, New York engaged in the production of blast furnace coke, was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The Department conducted a survey of the subject company's major customers regarding their purchases of blast furnace coke. The survey revealed that none of the customers purchased imported blast furnace coke during the relevant period. United States aggregate imports of coke and semicoke declined in the January through September 2001 period over the corresponding January through September 2000 period. The investigation further revealed that although Bethlehem Steel Corporation imports blast furnace coke, these imports had no effect on the Lackawanna plant because they went to facilities never supplied by the Lackawanna plant.

The petitioner alleges that increased imports of steel had a direct effect on coke consumption, thus impacting the Lackawanna coke plant. The petitioner further states that "the long term trends of higher coke and steel imports resulted in the shutdown of Lackawanna."

Steel imports into the United States is not relevant to the TAA investigation that was filed on behalf of workers producing blast furnace coke. The product imported must be "like or directly" competitive with what the subject firm plant produced and the imports must "contribute importantly" to the layoffs at the subject plant to meet the eligibility requirements for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974. Further examination of the facts developed in the initial investigation show that company imports, customer imports and aggregate U.S. imports of blast furnace coke did not "contribute importantly" to the layoffs at the subject plant.

### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of April, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-13540 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,449]

#### **Clebert's Hosiery Mill, Inc., Connelly Springs, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

By letter of March 29, 2002, the company requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on February 15, 2002, based on the finding that imports of socks did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the Connelly Springs plant. The denial