

and used automobiles to individual owners at an automotive dealership. The workers of the subject firm did not perform additional, value-added production processes or services directly to any of the certified primary firms during the investigation period. Thus, the subject firm workers are not eligible for TAA as downstream producers under secondary impact. Further, the subject firm is not an upstream supplier because it did not provide services to a TAA-certified firm during the investigation period.

The petitioner also alleged that increased imports of foreign-produced automobiles negatively impacted business of the subject firm and, therefore, workers who perform sales and service of domestic automobiles should be eligible for TAA.

When assessing a worker group's eligibility to apply for TAA, the Department exclusively considers imports of articles like or directly competitive with those manufactured by the subject firm or services like or directly competitive with those supplied by the workers of the subject firm during the relevant period. It was revealed during the initial investigation that the subject firm neither imported services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by worker group nor shifted to or acquired from foreign country services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by worker group.

The petitioners did not supply facts not previously considered and did not provide any documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts 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 16th day of February, 2010.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4246 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-72,231]

#### **Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

On December 23, 2009, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice of affirmative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 6, 2010 (75 FR 878).

The initial investigation, initiated on September 8, 2009, resulted in a negative determination, issued on November 5, 2009, that was based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift in production to a foreign country occurred. The notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2010 (75 FR 3935).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied additional information to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department carefully reviewed new information provided by the petitioner and contacted the company official for additional information and clarification of previously-submitted information.

The reconsideration investigation revealed that the subject firm is shifting production of articles like or directly competitive with cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients from the subject facility to a foreign country and that this shift on production contributed importantly to worker separations during the relevant period.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, including on-site leased workers of Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, who are

engaged in employment related to the production of cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients, 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 Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, including on-site leased workers of Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, who are engaged in employment related to the production of cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 2, 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 2nd day of February, 2010.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4249 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

TA-W-71,375

#### **AK Steel Corporation, Mansfield Works Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Time Customized Staffing Solutions, Mansfield, OH; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

On January 8, 2010, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice of affirmative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 1, 2010 (75 FR 5145).

The initial investigation, initiated on June 24, 2009, resulted in a negative determination, issued on November 2, 2009, that was based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift in production to a foreign country occurred. The notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2010 (75 FR 3935).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied

additional information regarding the customers of the subject firm to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department requested an additional list of customers from the subject firm and conducted a customer survey to determine whether imports of steel coils negatively impacted employment at AK Steel Corporation, Mansfield Works Division, Mansfield, Ohio.

The survey of the subject firm's major declining customers revealed that the customers increased their imports of steel coils while decreasing purchases from the subject firm from 2007 to 2008.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of AK Steel Corporation, Mansfield Works Division, including on-site leased workers from Time Customized Staffing Solutions, Mansfield, Ohio, who are engaged in employment related to the production of steel coils, 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 AK Steel Corporation, Mansfield Works Division, including on-site leased workers from Time Customized Staffing Solutions, Mansfield, Ohio, 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 18th day of February, 2010.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4245 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (10-024)]

### Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive License

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to grant exclusive license.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is issued in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 209(c)(1) and 37 CFR 404.7(a)(1)(i). NASA hereby gives notice of its intent to grant an exclusive, license in the United States to practice the invention described and claimed in US Patent Application No. 10/885,537, and NASA Case No. ARC-15204-1 entitled "Rapid Polymer Sequencer" to Abraxis BioScience, LLC, having its principal place of business in 11755 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 2000, Los Angeles, CA 90025. The patent rights in this invention have been assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The prospective exclusive license will comply with the terms and conditions of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7.

**DATES:** The prospective exclusive license may be granted unless, within fifteen (15) days from the date of this published notice, NASA receives written objections including evidence and argument that establish that the grant of the license would not be consistent with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7. Competing applications completed and received by NASA within fifteen (15) days of the date of this published notice will also be treated as objections to the grant of the contemplated exclusive license.

Objections submitted in response to this notice will not be made available to the public for inspection and, to the extent permitted by law, will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

**ADDRESSES:** Objections relating to the prospective license may be submitted to Patent Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, NASA Ames Research Center, Mail Stop 202A-4, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000. (650) 604-5104; Fax (650) 604-2767.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert M. Padilla, Chief Patent Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, NASA Ames Research Center, Mail Stop 202A-4, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000. (650) 604-5104; Fax (650) 604-2767. Information about other NASA inventions available for licensing can be found online at <http://technology.nasa.gov/>.

Dated: February 24, 2010.

**Richard W. Sherman,**

*Deputy General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4193 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0394]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The NRC published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on October 14, 2009.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* New.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR part 5, "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance".

3. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-XXXX.

4. *The form number if applicable:* N/A.

5. *How often the collection is required:* 10 CFR 5 follows provisions covered in 10 CFR 4, Section 4.331 Compliance Reviews, which indicates NRC may conduct compliance reviews and Pre-Award reviews of recipients or use other similar procedures that will permit it to investigate and correct violations of the act and these regulations. NRC may conduct these reviews even in absence of a complaint against a recipient. The reviews may be as comprehensive as necessary to determine whether a violation of these regulations has occurred.

6. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Recipients of Federal Financial Assistance provided by the NRC (including Educational Institutions, Other Nonprofit Organizations receiving Federal Assistance, and Agreement States).

7. *An estimate of the number of annual responses:* 800 (600 responses plus 200 recordkeepers).

8. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 200.