

Dietrich, Slover & Loftus, 1224 Seventeenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1150.31. If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10505(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

Decided: January 17, 1995.

By the Commission, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-1632 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Information Collections Under Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been sent the following collection(s) of information proposals for review under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35) and the Paperwork Reduction Reauthorization Act since the last list was published. Entries are grouped into submission categories, with each entry containing the following information:

- (1) The title of the form/collection;
- (2) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection;
- (3) Who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract;
- (4) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond;
- (5) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection; and,
- (6) An indication as to whether Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511 applies.

Comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the OMB reviewer, Mr. Jeff Hill on (202) 395-7340 and to the Department of Justice's Clearance Officer, Mr. Robert B. Briggs, on (202) 514-4319. If you anticipate commenting on a form/collection, but find that time to prepare such comments will prevent you from prompt submission, you should notify the OMB reviewer and the Department of Justice Clearance Officer of your intent as soon as possible. Written comments regarding the burden

estimate or any other aspect of the collection may be submitted to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503, and to Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Department of Justice Clearance Officer, Systems Policy Staff/ Information Resources Management/ Justice Management Division, Suite 850, WCTR, Washington, DC 20530.

Extension of a Currently Approved Collection

- (1) Claims Under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.
 - (2) Civil Division, United States Department of Justice.
 - (3) Primary = Individuals or households, Others = None. Information is needed to determine whether an applicant is eligible for a statutory compensation payment. Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, 42 United States Code Annotated Section 2210 note (Supp. 1994). Applicants are persons who reside near the Nevada Test Site, onsite participants in an atmospheric nuclear weapons test, and persons employed in an underground uranium mine.
 - (4) 2,000 annual respondents at 2.5 hours per response.
 - (5) 5,000 annual burden hours.
 - (6) Not applicable under Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96-511.
- Public comment on this item is encouraged.

Dated: January 17, 1995.

Robert B. Briggs,
Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.
[FR Doc. 95-1431 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-12-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA-W) issued during the period of December, 1994.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-30,470; *Gist-Brocades Foods Ingredients, East Brunswick, NJ*
TA-W-30,419; *Stone Forest Industries, Albany, OR*
TA-W-30,483; *EFR Corp., Everett, WA*
TA-W-30,477; *Coombs Vermont Natural Products, Wilmington, VT*
TA-W-30,454; *Most Manufacturing, Inc., Colorado Springs, CO*

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

TA-W-30,414; *Texaco Refining and Marketing, Inc., Fuels Operation, Tulsa, OK*

Increased Imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-30,159; *Elco Corp., Huntington, PA*

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-30,451; *Robertshaw Controls Co., Grayson Controls Div., El Paso, TX*

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-30,444; *Martin Marietta, Utica, NY*

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-30,449; *Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co., Youngstown, OH*

The decision to shut down was made in April 1994, and all were laid off by June 1994. Prior to shutdown, sales and production at the facility had increased in 1993 compared to 1992.