

The Department has determined that criterion (3) of section 246 has not been met. Competition conditions within the workers' industry are not adverse.

*None.*

#### **Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance**

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the eligibility criteria for worker adjustment assistance have not been met for the reasons specified.

Because the workers of the firm are not eligible to apply for TAA, the workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.A.) and (a)(2)(B)(II.A.) (employment decline) have not been met.

*TA-W-62,597; Parma Corporation, Denton, NC.*

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.B.) (Sales or production, or both, did not decline) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

*None.*

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.C.) (increased imports) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

*TA-W-62,400; Janesville Acoustics, Grand Rapids, MI.*

*TA-W-62,541; GE Consumer and Industrial, Electrical Equipment Division, West Burlington, IA.*

The workers' firm does not produce an article as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

*TA-W-62,341; Nortel Networks Corporation, Global Order Fulfillment, Research Triangle Park, NC.*

*TA-W-62,479; Grand Knitting Mills, Blueberry Boulevard, LLC, Amityville, NY.*

*TA-W-62,493; Electronic Data Systems, Computer Operators of the Mainframe Disaster, Recovery Testing for GM, Flint, MI.*

*TA-W-62,599; J.C. Matthews and Company, Inc., Galax, VA.*

*TA-W-62,627; Newton Transportation Company, Inc., Hudson, NC.*

*TA-W-62,675; Syncreon-US, INAP Operation, Division of Syncreon Automotive, Detroit, MI.*

The investigation revealed that criteria of Section 222(b)(2) has not been met. The workers' firm (or subdivision) is not a supplier to or a downstream producer for a firm whose workers were certified eligible to apply for TAA.

*None.*

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the period of *January 14 through January 18, 2008*. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C-5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: January 24, 2008.

**Ralph DiBattista,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-1825 Filed 1-31-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

##### **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-62,677]

##### **Llink Technologies, LLC, Brown City, MO; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 14, 2008 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Llink Technologies, LLC, Brown City, Missouri.

The Department has determined that this petition is a photocopy of petition number TA-W-62,630, instituted on January 3, 2008. The investigation of that petition is ongoing and determination has not yet been issued. Therefore, further investigation in the case would serve no purpose, and this investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of January, 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-1828 Filed 1-31-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

##### **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-62,703]

##### **Syngenta Inc. Crop Protection Division, Bucks, AL; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 18, 2008 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of

workers of Syngenta Inc., Crop Protection Division, Bucks, Alabama.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active certification (TA-W-59,181), which expires on April 21, 2008. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 25th day of January 2008.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-1823 Filed 1-31-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

##### **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-62,670]

##### **Visteon Concordia VRAP, Concordia, MO; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 14, 2008 in response to a petition filed by the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America on behalf of workers of Visteon Concordia VRAP, Concordia, Missouri.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of January, 2008.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-1827 Filed 1-31-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

##### **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-61,760]

##### **Hutchinson Technology, Eau Claire, WI; Notice of Negative Determination on Remand**

On November 6, 2007, the U.S. Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the U.S. Department of Labor's motion for a voluntary remand in *Former Employees of Hutchinson Technology v. U.S. Secretary of Labor*, Court No. 07-335.

On June 21, 2007, a TAA Coordinator for the State of Wisconsin filed a

petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) on behalf of workers and former workers at Hutchinson Technology, Eau Claire, Wisconsin (the subject facility) producing suspension assemblies for disc drives (the subject worker group). Administrative Record (AR) 1–3.

The Department's negative determination, issued on July 10, 2007 (72 41088, July 26, 2007), was based on findings that worker separations at the subject facility were caused by declining sales due to decreased exports and that the subject firm did not import suspension assemblies for disc drives. AR 19.

On August 22, 2007, a former employee of the subject firm (the petitioner) requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination. Supplemental Administrative Record (SAR) 28–30. In that request, the petitioner asserted that “the decision made on July 10, 2007 was made in error because the U.S. Department of Labor did not have all of the facts relevant to the application.” SAR 28. On September 28, 2007, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm, because the Department determined that additional information received from the petitioner concerning the subject firm's customers merited investigation. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 5, 2007 (72 FR 57070). SAR 34.

On September 7, 2007, while the request for reconsideration was pending before the Department, the petitioner appealed the denial of its petition to the USCIT. The appeal was based on the same information that appeared in the request for reconsideration. On November 6, 2007 the Department obtained a voluntary remand of the USCIT proceeding so that the Department could investigate the allegations and information provided by the Plaintiff in the request for reconsideration.

In the request for reconsideration the petitioner acknowledged that “currently the majority of hard drive suspensions are exported overseas”. AR 29. However, the requester also stated that the subject firm separated a significant number of workers and that sales and production have decreased during the relevant time period, and that this negative impact was a direct result of the loss of the Argon product line at the subject firm to a foreign competitor based in Singapore.

The Department contacted the petitioner to obtain additional information regarding the Argon product line and the imports impacting the subject firm. The petitioner did not have any additional information and requested the Department to verify all the information with the officials of the subject firm. SAR 64.

The Department contacted a company official to address this allegation. The company official clarified that Argon is the name of a specific suspension assembly product that was manufactured for a major customer headquartered in the United States. The company official further confirmed that Argon product line was lost to a foreign competitor, which resulted in declines in total sales, production and employment at the subject firm. SAR 36. The decline in sales to this customer represented nearly the entire subject firm's total domestic sales decline. The official also stated that Argon product line was specifically sold and shipped to a customer's foreign subsidiary and was not sold on the domestic market. SAR 39, 45. Therefore, the losses in sales and production of Argon line and consequent decline in employment at the subject firm are the direct result of the decrease in exports.

The Department contacted the major domestic customer who purchased the Argon-line products to confirm this information. It was confirmed that this customer purchased these products for export to a foreign subsidiary and no suspension assembly products have been imported into the United States by this customer. SAR 45, 46, 67.

The request for reconsideration further alleged that “the majority of hard drive suspensions are exported overseas to be assembled into computer hard drives and imported back into the United States.” SAR 29. The petitioner concluded that imported finished products which contain foreign manufactured components are like or directly competitive with imported finished products containing components manufactured by the subject firm and therefore, the subject firm should be considered import impacted.

In order to establish import impact, the Department must consider imports that are like or directly competitive with the products manufactured by the petitioning worker group. Suspension assemblies are components of computer hard drives, which incorporate multiple components. Therefore, suspension assemblies are not like or directly competitive with the computer hard drives produced abroad and imported by the subject firm or its customers.

Accordingly, imports of computer hard drives are not relevant in this investigation and increased imports of computer hard drives cannot be the basis for certification of the subject worker group. *International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW, Local 834 v. Donovan*, 592 F. Supp. 673, 677–679 (C.I.T. 1984).

In the request for reconsideration the petitioner further alleged that Hutchinson Technology, Inc. shifted functions of the microscope inspection labor to either Singapore, Thailand and/or China via sub-contracting. SAR 29, 30.

The Department contacted the petitioner to obtain additional information regarding the sorting functions. The petitioner stated that sorting was not a part of the production process, but is integrated into the production cost and that workers performing these functions should be considered in support of production. While uncertain, the petitioner conjectured that the sorting functions had been shifted to Singapore but that the Department should rely on information received from the officials of the subject firm. SAR 64.

The Department contacted a company official to address this allegation. The company official stated that the subject firm used its service center in Thailand to undertake inspection and sorting and that some sorting functions have been shifted from the subject firm to Thailand in the relevant time period. The official also stated that workers performing sorting and inspection functions do not produce suspension assemblies for disk drives, but rather support production of all suspension assemblies for disk drives. SAR 47, 66. The subject firm did not shift production of suspension assemblies for disk drives abroad. SAR 36.

Furthermore, Thailand is not a country that is a party to a free trade agreement with the United States or a country that is named as a beneficiary under the Andean Trade Preference Act, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act. Any shift to Thailand cannot be the basis for certification of the subject worker group.

During the initial phase of the reconsideration/remand investigation, the Department contacted Plaintiff for additional information and clarification of his allegations. Once Plaintiff had retained Counsel, the parties filed a consent motion for a 30-day extension of the remand period so that Plaintiff's Counsel had an opportunity to review the record and provide the Department

with comments and other pertinent information. That motion was granted on December 12, 2007. The Counsel was provided with the business confidential information from the initial administrative record as well as with the material generated in the reconsideration/remand investigation. While the investigator contacted Plaintiff's Counsel to remind him of his opportunity, the Department received no substantive input. SAR 68–70.

In addition, in accordance with section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department herein presents the results of its remand investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the subject worker group must be certified as eligible to apply for TAA. Since the workers have been denied certification for TAA, they cannot be certified for ATAA.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the findings of the remand investigation, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Hutchinson Technology, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 18th day of January 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8–1826 Filed 1–31–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Bureau of Labor Statistics

#### Proposed Collection, Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a pre-clearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection

requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Program. A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the **Addresses** section of this notice on or before April 1, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Amy A. Hobby, BLS Clearance Officer, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Room 4080, 2 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Washington, DC 20212, 202–691–7628. (This is not a toll free number.)

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amy A. Hobby, BLS Clearance Officer, 202–691–7628. (See **ADDRESSES** section.)

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **I. Background**

The Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program, a Federal/State cooperative effort, produces monthly employment and quarterly wage information. It is a by-product of quarterly reports submitted to State Workforce Agencies (SWAs) by employers subject to State Unemployment Insurance (UI) laws. The collection of these data is authorized by 29 U.S.C. 1, 2. The QCEW data, which are compiled for each calendar quarter, provide a comprehensive business name and address file with employment and wage information for employers subject to State UI laws. Similar data for Federal Government employers covered by the Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees program also are included. These data are submitted to the BLS by all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The BLS summarizes these data to produce totals for all counties, Metropolitan Statistical Areas, the States, and the nation. The QCEW program provides a virtual census of nonagricultural employees and their wages, with about 51 percent of the workers in agriculture covered as well.

The QCEW program is a comprehensive and accurate source of data on the number of establishments, monthly employment, and quarterly wages, by industry, at the six-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) level, and at the national, State, Metropolitan Statistical Area, and county levels. The QCEW series has broad economic significance

in measuring labor trends and major industry developments, in time series analyses and industry comparisons, and in special studies such as analyses of establishments, employment, and wages by size of establishment.

### **II. Current Action**

Office of Management and Budget clearance is being sought for the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program.

The QCEW program is the only Federal statistical program that provides information on establishments, wages, tax contributions and the number of employees subject to State UI laws and the Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees program. The consequences of not collecting QCEW data would be grave to the Federal statistical community. The BLS would not have a sampling frame for its establishment surveys; it would not be able to publish as accurate current estimates of employment for the U.S., States, and metropolitan areas; and it would not be able to publish quarterly census totals of local establishment counts, employment and wages. The Bureau of Economic Analysis would not be able to publish as accurate personal income data in a timely manner for the U.S., States, and local areas. Finally, the Employment Training Administration would not have the information it needs to administer the Unemployment Insurance Program.

### **III. Desired Focus of Comments**

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is particularly interested in comments that:

- 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.

- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.

- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.

- 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 submissions of responses.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Agency:* Bureau of Labor Statistics.