The transactions described in section 408(b)(14) are: The provision of investment advice to the participant or beneficiary with respect to a security or other property available as an investment under the plan; the acquisition, holding or sale of a security or other property available as an investment under the plan pursuant to the investment advice; and the direct or indirect receipt of compensation by a fiduciary adviser or affiliate in connection with the provision of investment advice or the acquisition, holding or sale of a security or other property available as an investment under the plan pursuant to the investment advice. The requirements in section 408(g) are met only if advice is provided by a fiduciary adviser under an "eligible investment advice arrangement." Section 408(g) provides for two general types of eligible arrangements: One based on compliance with a "fee-leveling" requirement (imposing limitation on fees and compensation of the fiduciary adviser); the other, based on compliance with a "computer model" requirement (requiring use of a certified computer

The regulation contains the following collections of information: (1) A fiduciary adviser must furnish an initial disclosure that provides detailed information to participants about an advice arrangement before initially providing investment advice; (2) a fiduciary adviser must engage, at least annually, an independent auditor to conduct an audit of the investment advice arrangement for compliance with the regulation; (3) if the fiduciary adviser provides the investment advice through the use of a computer model, then before providing the advice, the fiduciary adviser must obtain the written certification of an eligible investment expert as to the computer model's compliance with certain standards (e.g., applies generally accepted investment theories, unbiased operation, objective criteria) set forth in the regulation; and (4) fiduciary advisers must maintain records with respect to the investment advice provided in reliance on the regulation necessary to determine whether the applicable requirements of the regulation have been satisfied.

The ICR was approved by OMB under OMB Control Number 1210–0134 and is scheduled to expire on October 31, 2014.

Agency: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

Title: Alternative Method of Compliance for Certain Simplified Employee Pensions. *Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection of information.

OMB Number: 1210–0034. Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits.

Respondents: 36,000. Responses: 68,000.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 21,000.

Estimated Total Burden Cost (Operating and Maintenance): \$23,000.

Description: Section 110 of ERISA authorizes the Secretary to prescribe alternative methods of compliance with the reporting and disclosure requirements of Title I of ERISA for pension plans. Simplified employee pensions (SEPs) are established in section 408(k) of the Internal Revenue Code (Code). Although SEPs are primarily a development of the Code and subject to its requirements, SEPs are also pension plans subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of Title I of ERISA.

The Department previously issued a regulation under the authority of section 110 of ERISA (29 CFR 2520.104-49) that intended to relieve sponsors of certain SEPs from ERISA's Title I reporting and disclosure requirements by prescribing an alternative method of compliance. These SEPs are, for purposes of this Notice, referred to as "non-model" SEPs because they exclude (1) those SEPs which are created through use of Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form 5305-SEP, and (2) those SEPs in which the employer limits or influences the employees' choice to IRAs into which employers' contributions will be made and on which participant withdrawals are prohibited. The disclosure requirements in this regulation were developed in conjunction with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS Notice 81-1). Accordingly, sponsors of "nonmodel" SEPs that satisfy the limited disclosure requirements of the regulation are relieved from otherwise applicable reporting and disclosure requirements under Title I of ERISA, including the requirements to file annual reports (Form 5500 Series) with the Department, and to furnish summary plan descriptions and summary annual reports to participants and beneficiaries.

This ICR includes four separate disclosure requirements. First, at the time an employee becomes eligible to participate in the SEP, the administrator of the SEP must furnish the employee in writing specific and general information concerning the SEP; a statement on rates, transfers and withdrawals; and a statement on tax treatment. Second, the administrator of the SEP must furnish

participants with information concerning any amendments. Third, the administrator must notify participants of any employer contributions made to the IRA. Fourth, in the case of a SEP that provides integration with Social Security, the administrator shall provide participants with statement on Social Security taxes and the integration formula used by the employer. The ICR was approved by OMB under OMB Control Number 1210–0034 and is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2014.

#### II. Focus of Comments

The Department is particularly interested in comments that:

- Evaluate whether the collections of information are 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 collections 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., by permitting electronic submissions of responses.

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

Dated: April 29, 2014.

#### Joseph S. Piacentini,

Director, Office of Policy and Research, Employee Benefits Security Administration. [FR Doc. 2014–11749 Filed 5–20–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-83,184]

Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc.; Engineering Department; North American Division; Phoenix, Arizona; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination was based on the Department's findings that the petitioning worker group at Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Phoenix, Arizona (subject firm) did not meet the eligibility criteria of the Trade Act, as amended. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2014 (79 FR 8736).

The request for reconsideration asserts that the petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance was filed on behalf of the Engineering Department and that the scope of the initial investigation was too broad and, therefore, detrimental to the petitioning workers.

Based on information collected from the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation, the Department determines that the subject firm shifted to a foreign country the supply of services like or directly competitive with those provided by the workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona, meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 29, 2012, through two years from the date of this certification, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on date of certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 29th day of April, 2014.

#### Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2014–11640 Filed 5–20–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

## **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-82,697]

#### AT&T Corporation; a Subsidiary of AT&T Inc.; Business Billing Customer Care; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On October 23, 2013, the Department of Labor (Department) issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of AT&T Corporation, a subsidiary of AT&T Inc., Business Billing Customer Care, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (hereafter referred to as "the subject firm"). Workers at the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the supply of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services.

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 negative determination was based on the Department's findings that there no increased imports, during the relevant period, of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by the subject workers; the subject firm has not shifted the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by the subject workers to a foreign country or acquired the supply of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services from a foreign country; the worker separations are attributable to a shift of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services to other locations within the United States; the subject firm is not a Supplier to, or act as a Downstream Producer to, a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a); and the workers' firm has not been publicly identified by name by the International Trade Commission as a member of a domestic industry in an investigation resulting in

an affirmative finding of serious injury, market disruption, or material injury, or threat thereof.

The request for reconsideration alleges that the subject firm has shifted billing services, ordering services, and/or customer support services to Slovakia, Mexico, India, and/or the Philippines. The worker requesting reconsideration also supplied additional information in regard to employment figures at the aforementioned locations and subsequently submitted multiple documents and attachments related to the afore-mentioned allegations.

During the course of the reconsideration investigation, the subject firm addressed the aforementioned allegations and confirmed the meaning of multiple documents and attachments provided by the worker requesting reconsideration.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department received information which confirmed that the subject firm has not imported, during the relevant period, any services like or directly competitive with billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm; the subject firm did not shift the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm, and; the subject firm did not acquire from a foreign country the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm.

Additional information obtained from the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation revealed that the subject firm does not import any finished products that incorporate services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by the subject firm.

Therefore, after careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

### Conclusion

After careful review, I determine that the requirements of Section 222 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272, have not been met and, therefore, deny the petition for group eligibility of AT&T Corporation, a subsidiary of AT&T Inc., Business Billing Customer Care, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to apply for adjustment assistance, in accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273.