of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the workers' firm, increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles into which one or more component parts produced by the workers' firm are directly incorporated, or increased imports of articles like or directly incorporating one or more component parts produced outside of the United States that are like or directly competitive with imports of articles incorporating one or more component parts produced by the workers' firm.

During the initial investigation, the Department inquired into the allegation that "As of July 2010 our film used to produce the newspaper and made in Japan will no longer be manufactured anywhere." The investigation confirmed that the subject firm produced print publications and revealed that, while there is a general decline of the film manufacturing industry, the separations at the subject firm are unrelated to increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with the print publications produced at the subject firm or a shift of production to a foreign country, or acquisition from a foreign country, of articles like or directly competitive with the print publications produced at the subject firm.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleges that the subject workers are eligible to apply for TAA as adversely affected secondary workers.

The petitioning workers do not meet the criteria set forth in Section 222(c) because the subject firm neither supplied component parts for the product made by a firm that employed a worker group that is currently eligible to apply for TAA (Konica) nor engaged in a further stage of production of the articles produced by a firm that employed a worker group that is currently eligible to apply for TAA (Konica). Neither of those relationships exists between Dow Jones & Company, West Middlesex, Pennsylvania, and any Konica facility.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

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

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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 9th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18191 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

TA–W–71,483, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Houston, TX; TA–W–71,483A, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Tampa, FL; TA–W–71,483B, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Salt Lake City, UT; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 10, 2010, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was signed on April 16, 2010. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 20, 2010 (75 FR 28301).

Workers of Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division are engaged in employment related to the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation 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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The negative determination applicable to workers and former workers at Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Houston, Texas, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Tampa, Florida, and Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Salt Lake City, Utah, was based on the findings that the subject firm did not, during the period under investigation, shift to a foreign country the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services) or acquire from a foreign country the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services); that the workers' separation, or threat of separation, was not related to any increase in imports of the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services) or the shift/acquisition of the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services); and that the workers did not supply a service that was directly used in the production of an article or the supply of service by a firm that employed a worker group that is eligible to apply for TAA based on the afore-mentioned article or service.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner states that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA because the subject firm has shifted abroad the airline travel arrangement and reservation services provided by the workers. The petitioner also asserts that the subject firm has separated additional workers and more separations are anticipated at various locations throughout the United States. Additionally, the petitioner states that the subject firm facility in Denver, Colorado was not considered in the investigation.

During the initial investigation, the Department obtained information that shows that the subject firm did not shift the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services to a foreign country and that the worker separations were due to the diminished need for such services due to increased use of technology (on-line self-service reservations systems and electronic ticketing).

Because workers are not eligible to file a petition for locations other than the one at which they are or were employed, the petitioner's assertion that the Department should have included the Denver, Colorado location in the determination is not a basis for reconsideration.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either: (1) A mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

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

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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, D.C., this 15th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18185 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–71,494]

Johns Manville; Engineered Products Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Volt Workforce Solutions; Spartanburg, SC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated May 2, 2010, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination applicable to the subject firm. The determination was based on the Department's finding that neither increased imports nor a shift in production to a foreign country contributed importantly to worker separations at the subject firm. The workers are engaged in employment related to the production of polyester non-woven fabric. The negative determination was issued on April 16, 2010. The Department's Notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 20, 2010 (75 FR 28301).

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleged that increased production at an affiliated facility in China caused the loss of business at the Spartanburg, South Carolina facility.

Based on additional information provided by the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation, the Department determines that the subject firm has shifted to a foreign country the production of articles like or directly competitive with the polyester non-woven fabric produced at the subject facility and that the shift of production to China contributed importantly to worker separations at the Spartanburg, South Carolina facility.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Johns Manville, Engineered Products Division, Spartanburg, South Carolina, who are engaged in employment related to the production of polyester non-woven fabric, 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 Johns Manville, Engineered Products Division, including on-site leased workers from Volt Workforce Solutions, Spartanburg, South Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 23, 2008, 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 9th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18186 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice: (10–084)]

NASA Advisory Council; Ad-Hoc Task Force on Planetary Defense; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a two-part meeting of the Ad-Hoc Task Force on Planetary Defense of the NASA Advisory Council.

DATES: Tuesday, August 17, 2010, 12 p.m.–3 p.m., and Friday, August 20, 2010, 12 p.m.–3 p.m. All times are Eastern Daylight Time.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held via WebEx/Teleconference on both dates.

- August 17, 12 p.m.–3 p.m.: To view briefings, log in to Web site at *https://nasa.webex.com.* Meeting Number: 993 545 318. Passcode: Tuesday817! Join teleconference by dialing toll-free 888–566–1673. Passcode: 12080.
- August 20, 12 p.m.–3 p.m.: To view briefings, log in to Web site at *https://nasa.webex.com.* Meeting Number: 995 328 530. Passcode: Friday820! Join teleconference by dialing toll-free 888–566–1673. Passcode: 12080.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jane Parham, Exploration Systems Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Headquarters, Washington, DC 20546, 202–358–1715, *jane.parham@nasa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda topic is: Drafting of the Ad-Hoc Task Force on Planetary Defense Final Report to the NASA Advisory Council. The meeting will be open to the public up to the capacity of WebEx and teleconference lines. It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants.

For questions, please call Jane Parham, 202–358–1815, *jane.parham@nasa.gov.*

Dated: July 19, 2010.

P. Diane Rausch,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–18147 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: NARA is giving public notice that the agency has submitted to OMB for approval the information collection described in this notice. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to OMB at the address below on or before August 25, 2010 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Mr. William N. Tucker, Desk Officer for NARA, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; fax: 202–395–5167; or electronically mailed to *William_N._Tucker@omb.eop.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or