

completion of the remedy. The United States also sought a penalty from the defendants under Section 104(e) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9604(e), based on the defendants' alleged unreasonable failure to comply with written information requests served upon them by EPA.

Under the Consent Decree, Georgoulis will reimburse the United States for \$530,000 of its unreimbursed costs at the Site, and pay a \$100,000 civil penalty to resolve the United States' claims for the defendants' alleged violations of Section 104(e) of CERCLA.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. TIC Investment Corporation, et al.*, DOJ Ref. #90-11-2-665a.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, Suite 400, Hach Building, 401 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401; the Region 7 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 98105; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$4.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 97-1592 Filed 1-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Notice of Charter Renewal

In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Title 5, United States Code, Appendix 2), and Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 101-6.1015, the Director, FBI, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, has determined that the continuance of the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board is in the public interest, in connection with the

performance of duties imposed upon the FBI by law, and hereby gives notice of the renewal of its charter, scheduled for December 15, 1996.

The Board recommends to the Director, FBI, general policy with respect to the philosophy, concept, and operational principles of the various criminal justice information systems managed by the FBI's CJIS Division.

The Board includes representatives from state and local criminal justice agencies; members of the judicial, prosecutorial, and correctional segments of the criminal justice community; a representative of Federal agencies participating in the CJIS systems; and representatives of criminal justice professional associations (i.e., the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and the American Probation and Parole Association). All members of the Board will be appointed by the FBI Director.

The Board functions solely as an advisory body in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Its charter will be filed in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Dated: November 2, 1996.

Louis J. Freeh,

Director.

[FR Doc. 97-1594 Filed 1-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-32, 709; NAFTA-01224]

Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated, Washington, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On November 27, 1996, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The petitioner, American Flint Glass Workers Union, AFL-CIO, presented evidence that the Department's survey of the subject firm customers was incomplete. This notice was published in the Federal Register on December 13, 1996 (61 FR 65599).

The Department's initial denial of TAA for workers of Penn Mould Industries was because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not

met. The investigation revealed that layoffs were attributable to a change in the manufacturing process of glass molds at the Washington, Pennsylvania plant.

The Department's initial denial of NAFTA-TAA for workers of Penn Mould Industries was because criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) of Section 250 of the Trade Act were not met. The subject firm did not import glass forming molds, or shift production to Mexico or Canada. The investigation revealed that layoffs were attributable to a process change in the manufacturing of glass forming molds.

The petitioner provided data on U.S. imports of glass containers to support their claim that workers producing glass forming molds are adversely affected by increased imports. The Department concurs that there is an aggregate increase in imports of glass containers from Mexico and Canada and other foreign sources. However, in order to determine worker eligibility for TAA or NAFTA-TAA, the Department must examine imports of products like or directly competitive with those articles produced at the Washington production facility. In this case, the products produced at Washington were glass forming molds. Glass containers cannot be considered like or directly competitive with the end products produced and sold at the Washington plant.

The petitioner claims that Penn Mould was a captive producer of glass forming molds for its parent company, Ball-Foster Glass Container, Inc. On July 1, 1996, Penn Mould was sold to Ross Mould, Inc. and the Washington, Pennsylvania facility became a commercial producer of glass forming molds. Consequently, the customer base expanded.

The Department conducted a survey of the major customer of Penn Mould Industries, Inc., formerly Penn Mould. Findings of the survey revealed that from 1994 through September 1996, the customer, accounting for the predominate proportion of sales, did not import glass forming molds from Canada, Mexico or other foreign sources.

The petitioner further alleges that workers of another domestic company producing glass forming molds was certified eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA. Review of that case showed that the workers were certified based on increased company imports of the product.