

Services Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 4034, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536. Additionally, comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time may also be directed to Mr.

Richard A. Sloan.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Patrick Henry Building, 601 D Street, NW., Ste. 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 23, 2002.

**Richard A. Sloan,**

*Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.*

[FR Doc. 02-13601 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-10-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Justice Programs

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice of information collection under review: reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired; accounting system and financial capability questionnaire.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Program, has submitted the following information collection request of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for "sixty days" until July 29, 2002. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Cynthia J. Schwimer, Comptroller (202) 307-0623, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected

agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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 submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Reinstate, With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval has Expired.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire.

(3) *Agency from which, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: OJP Form 7120/1. Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as brief abstract:* Primary: Not-for-profit institutions. Other: For-profit institutions. This form will be completed by applicants that are newly-formed firms or established firms with no previous grants awarded by the Office of Justice Programs. It is used as an aide to determine those applicants/grantees that may require special attention in matters relating to the accountability of Federal funds. This information is required for assessing the financial risk of a potential recipient in administering federal funds in accordance with OMB Circular A-110 and 28 CFR part 70.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 100 respondents will complete a 4-hour form.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the*

*collection:* There are an estimated 400 annual total burden hours associated with this collection.

*If additional information is required contact:* Brenda E. Dyer, Department Deputy Clearance Officer, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 24, 2002.

**Brenda E. Dyer,**

*Department Deputy Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 02-13602 Filed 5-29-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-18-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,659 and NAFTA-05058]

#### Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of March 6, 2002, the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, AFL-CIO-CLC, Local 6-0111 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) under petition TA-W-39,659 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) under petition NAFTA-5058. The TAA and NAFTA-TAA denial notices applicable to workers of Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, Michigan, were signed on February 13, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 28, 2002 (67 FR 9326 & 9327, respectively).

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 mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Tower Automotive, Sebewaing, Michigan engaged in