

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of application for approval.

**SUMMARY:** The public is invited to comment on the following application for approval to conduct certain activities with birds that are protected in accordance with the Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992. This notice is provided pursuant to section 112(4) of the Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992, 50 CFR 15.26(c).

**DATES:** Written data, comments, or requests for a copy of this complete application must be received by August 23, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Written data, comments, or requests for a copy of this complete application should be sent to the Chief, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Management Authority, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andrea Gaski, Chief, Branch of CITES Operations, Division of Management Authority, at 703-358-2095.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Applicant:* Ms. Cathy S. MacKay of Redding, California.

The applicant wishes to establish a cooperative breeding program for silver-eared mesia (*Leiothrix argentauris*) and red-billed leiothrix (*Leiothrix lutea*). The applicant wishes to be an active participant in this program along with eight other individuals. The National Finch and Softbill Society has agreed to assume oversight responsibility of this program if it is approved. Documents and other information submitted with this application are available for review, *subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act*, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the following office within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice.

Dated: July 11, 2002.

**Mark Albert,**

*Acting Chief, Branch of CITES Operations, Division of Management Authority.*

[FR Doc. 02-18692 Filed 7-23-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[OR-100-6334-AA; GP2-0195A]

#### Roseburg District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Advisory Committee (RAC): Correction, Cancellation of Meetings

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings; cancellation.

**SUMMARY:** On May 20, 2002, the **Federal Register** published the dates of the Roseburg District BLM Resource Advisory Committee Meetings. The following meeting dates have been cancelled: July 22, 2002, July 29, 2002, August 13, 2002, August 19, 2002, and August 26, 2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The RAC meets in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), 5 U.S.C.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Additional information concerning the Roseburg District BLM Resource Advisory Committee may be obtained from E. Lynn Burkett, Public Affairs Officer, Roseburg District Office, 777 Garden Valley Blvd, Roseburg, Oregon 97470, or [elynn\\_burkett@blm.gov](mailto:elynn_burkett@blm.gov), or on the web at <http://www.or.blm.gov>.

Dated: July 19, 2002.

**Michael H. Schwartz,**

*Regulatory Affairs Group Manager.*

[FR Doc. 02-18802 Filed 7-22-02; 10:53 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-33-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,710]

#### Alpha Carb Enterprises, Leechburg, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of June 3, 2002, the company, 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 April 29, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35143).

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 Alpha Carb Enterprises, Leechburg, Pennsylvania engaged in the production of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies, 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 firm's major customers regarding their purchases of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies. The survey revealed that none of the customers increased their import purchases of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies, while reducing their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that they believe the TAA decision was based on the company being an importer of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies, rather than a manufacturer of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies.

A review of the initial investigation conducted for the subject plant workers treated the worker group as production workers engaged in activities related to the production of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies and not importers of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies.

The petitioner further believes that their customers are importing steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies from overseas, resulting in lost business at the subject plant.

A review of the initial investigation shows that none of the respondents increased their purchases of steel and tungsten carbide progressive dies, while decreasing their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

The petitioner also alleges that a local competitor was granted TAA eligibility and strongly believes they should be granted TAA eligibility based on that event.

As already indicated, the "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The TAA eligibility of a competitor does not show the direct impact of imports contributing to the subject plant layoffs and therefore is not relevant.

### 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