

**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

reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of July, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18642 Filed 7-23-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,255]

#### **American Greetings Corporation, Corbin, KY; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration; A Corrected Republication in Full**

A corrected republication in full is necessary for the Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers of American Greetings Corporation, Corbin, Kentucky, TA-W-41,455. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 9, 2002 (FR 67 45546), FR Document 02-17147. The word "not" was inadvertently omitted from the decision, and this correction is issued to insert the word "not" in the third paragraph, 4th line between the words "did" and "contribute". The notice is republished as follows:

By application received on June 6, 2002 and June 7, 2002, a worker and the Teamsters, Local 89, respectively, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on May 13, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 2002 (67 FR 38521).

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 petition for the workers of American Greetings Corporation, Corbin, Kentucky was denied because

the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations. The denial was based on Corbin, Kentucky production of printed greeting card sheets being consolidated with another American Greetings Corporation domestic production facility. The company did not import printed greeting card sheets during the relevant period.

The petitioners allege that American Greetings Corporation has been forced to restructure the company in order to cut costs, which resulted in lost jobs at the Corbin plant over a three year period, leading to the final closing of the subject plant. The petitioners further allege that the jobs lost at the Corbin plant is the result of American Greetings moving manufacturing production (candles, party goods, print greeting cards) from the Corbin plant to China, Mexico, Taiwan and Hong Kong. A copy of a label attached to the petitioner(s) request depicts that a product produced in China was imported directly to American Greetings Corp., Corbin, Kentucky.

A review of the initial decision and recent clarification by the company indicate there was no decline in the firm's customer base. Any declines in plant sales or production (party goods, gift wrap and bows, candles, printed greeting card sheets) are due to shifts in plant production to other domestic locations. That is, virtually all plant production was shifted to other domestic sources, except for a small portion of printed greeting card sheets that were ordered from a foreign source and scheduled to enter the United States beyond the relevant period of the investigation. In any event, the amount of printed greeting card sheets to be imported is relatively low and would not be considered a major contributing factor to the layoffs at the subject firm.

Further review and contact with the company shows that the preponderance in the declines in employment at the subject plant is related to other factors unrelated to imported products "like or directly competitive" with what the subject plant produced. That is, internet card competition and cost cutting measures such as the elimination of some high cost product lines and the consolidation of subject plant production to other affiliated domestic locations to cut costs are the dominant factors leading to the layoffs at the subject plant.

The Department contacted the company regarding a label attached and labels referenced in the petitioner's

request for reconsideration. The company indicated that some of the products produced by the subject plant have been intermittently imported, but the amount of each type of product imported was negligible during the relevant period.

In a further allegation by the petitioner, it is indicated that the subject plant candle production was shifted to China and imported back to the United States. The company indicated candles imported back to the United States were negligible during the relevant period.

### 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 reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC this 21st day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18634 Filed 7-23-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,516, TA-W-40,516C, and TA-W-40,516D]

#### **Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Target Square Facility, Clearfield, PA; Macclenny Products, Lake Butler Facility, Lake Butler, Florida; Macclenny, FL Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on May 7, 2002, applicable to workers of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Target Square Facility, Clearfield, Pennsylvania. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35141).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of men's sports coats, suit coats, blazers and slacks.

New information shows that worker separations occurred at the Macclenny Products, Lake Butler Facility, Lake Butler, Florida and Macclenny Products,