

(INS), Department of Justice (the source agency), is participating in computer matching programs with the District of Columbia and the State agencies listed below (all designated as recipient agencies). These matching activities will permit the recipient agencies to confirm the immigration status of alien applicants for, or recipients of, Federal benefits assistance under the "Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)" program as required by the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-603).<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, the matching activities will permit the following eligibility determinations:

(1) The District of Columbia Department of Employment Services, New York State Department of Labor, New Jersey Department of Labor, Texas Workforce Commission, and Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training will be able to determine eligibility for unemployment compensation;

(2) The California Department of Social Services will be able to determine eligibility status of aliens applying for or receiving benefits under the TANF ("Temporary Assistance for Needy Families") program, and upon the submission of favorable cost-benefit data to the Department of Justice (DOJ) Data Integrity Board, will also be able to determine eligibility status of non-TANF Food Stamp applicants and recipients;

(3) The California Department of Health Services will be able to determine eligibility status for the Medicaid program; and

(4) The Colorado Department of Human Services will be able to determine the eligibility status for the Medicaid, TANF, and the Food Stamps programs.

Section 121(c) of IRCA amends Section 1137 of the Social Security and other statutes to require agencies which administer the Federal entitlement benefit programs designated within IRCA as amended, to use the INS verification system to determine eligibility. Accordingly, through the use

<sup>1</sup> Effective July 1, 1997, IRCA was amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), Pubic Law 104-193, 110 Stat. 2168 (1996). The PRWORA amended IRCA by replacing the reference to "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (AFDC), with a reference to its successor program, "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families" (TANF). As was the case with AFDC, states and the District of Columbia are required to verify through SAVE that an applicant or recipient is in an eligible alien status for TANF benefits. In addition, Section 840 of the PRWORA makes verification for eligibility under the Food Stamps program voluntary on the part of the State/District of Columbia agency rather than mandatory.

of user identification codes and passwords, authorized persons from these agencies may electronically access the database of an INS system of records entitled "Alien Status Verification Index, Justice/INS-009". From its automated records system, any agency (named above) participating in these matching programs may enter electronically into the INS database the alien registration number of the applicant or recipient. This action will initiate a search of the INS database for a corresponding alien registration number. Where such number is located, the agency will receive electronically from the INS database the following data upon which to determine eligibility: alien registration number, last name, first name, date of birth, country of birth (not nationality), social security number (if available), date of entry, immigration status data, and employment eligibility data. In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552a(p), such agencies will provide the alien applicant with 30 days notice and an opportunity to contest any adverse finding before final action is taken against that alien because of ineligible immigration status as established through the computer match.

The original effective date of the matching programs (with the exception of the matching agreement with Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training) was January 29, 1990, for which notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 28, 1989 (54 FR 53382). The original effective date of the Massachusetts matching program was February 28, 1990, for which notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 29, 1990 (55 FR 2890). The programs have continued to date under the authority of a series of new approvals as required by the CMPPA. The CMPPA provides that based upon approval by agency Data Integrity Boards of a new computer matching agreement, computer matching activities may be conducted for 18 months and, contingent upon specific conditions, may be similarly extended by the Board for an additional year without the necessity of a new agreement. The most recent 1-year extension for those programs listed in items (1) through (4) above will expire on August 31, 2002, except that the agreement with the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training will expire on September 12, 2002. The DOJ's Data Integrity Board has approved new agreements to permit the above named computer matching programs to continue for another 18-month period

from the expiration date or after the notification period (described below) is satisfied, whichever is later.

Matching activities under the new agreements will be effective 30 days after publication of this computer matching notice in the **Federal Register**, or 40 days after a report concerning the computer matching programs has been transmitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and transmitted to Congress along with a copy of the agreements, whichever is later.

The agreements (and matching activities) will continue for a period of 18 months from the effective date, unless, within 3 months prior to the expiration of the agreement, the Data Integrity Board approves a 1-year extension pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o)(2)(D).

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552a(o)(2)(A) and (r), the required report has been provided to the OMB, and to the Congress together with a copy of the agreements.

Inquiries may be addressed to Kathleen M. Riddle, Procurement Analyst, Management and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: July 19, 2002.

**Robert F. Diegelman,**  
*Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration.*

[FR Doc. 02-18794 Filed 7-24-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4410-10-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Department of Labor.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly

understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Employment and Training Administration is soliciting comments about the proposed new collection of information as part of the Evaluation of Labor Exchange Services in a One-Stop Environment. The evaluation is partially composed of three surveys: an employer survey, an in-office job seeker survey, and an in-office survey of workshop participants.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses's section below on or before September 23, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Richard Muller, Office of Policy and Research, ETA, N-5637, US Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW. Washington, DC 20210, (202) 693-3680 (this is not a toll-free number), e-mail:

*RMULLER@DOLETA.GOV.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

Public labor exchanges (PLEX) were last evaluated by ETA in 1983. At that time, obtaining basic information about job-seekers' and employers' use of state labor exchanges was relatively easy, given that nearly all job seekers filled out registration forms and could only get a referral after being screened by staff at local offices. Similarly, employers had to describe job openings and key characteristics to staff to obtain referrals. Moreover, cost information was available because Wagner-Peyser Act funds were allocated to each state based on a type of performance-based budgeting, called the balanced placement formula, designed to stimulate improvements in placement

services by allocating grants to state agencies on the basis of their actual performance.

While special purpose block grants simplified distribution of Wagner-Peyser Act funds, the removal of the balanced formula eliminated the need to determine how costly it is for staff to perform various services, and also reduced incentives to carefully track delivery of individual services. Job seekers can now utilize large public databases, such as America's Job Bank (AJB), and every state labor exchange, by using PC modems at home, in libraries and a variety of other sites. The block grants and the easy access to electronic job information has greatly limited the amount of quantifiable data available to perform a comprehensive evaluation. In order to accurately measure the costs and benefits of PLEXs today, surveys of job seekers and employers are required to assess the quantity and quality of services provided.

**II. Review Focus**

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- \* 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;

- \* Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

- \* Enhance the quality, utility, and clarify of the information to be collected; and

- \* 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 submissions of responses.

**III. Current Actions**

This study will examine the efficacy of labor exchange services in 6 States operating within selected State One-Stop delivery systems. The findings from the employer survey and in-office surveys will describe the results of mail surveys and follow-up telephone interviews with diverse employers, and will describe the experiences of job seekers. The study will provide, among other things, in-depth information on:

- The amount of hiring done at each establishment in a year;
- The methods used to obtain applicants for high and low paying jobs;
- Satisfaction with methods used to obtain applicants;
- The costs associated with hiring and recruitment efforts;
- The costs to the establishment for not filling various types of jobs; and
- How placements made from public labor exchanges affect recruiting and production costs.

*Type of Review:* New.

*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration.

*Title:* Evaluation of Labor Exchange Services in a One Stop Environment.

*OMB Number:* 1205-0NEW.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households/Business or other for profit/ Not for profit institutions/Farms/Federal Government/State, Local or Tribal Government.

Cite/reference	Total respondents per state	Frequency	Total responses per state	Average time per response per hour	Burden hours per state
Employer survey & reminders .....	60	Once + reminder cards for non-respondents.	60	.5	30
Telephone interview .....	240	Once .....	240	.75	180
In-office survey .....	1200	Once .....	1200	.25	300
Workshop survey .....	1200	Once .....	1200	.25	300
<b>Totals .....</b>					<b>810</b>

**Total Burden Cost:** The total estimated cost of the study is \$160,200 over a 36-month contract period, with a one-year option. Of the total costs, approximately 11 percent is allocated for surveys. The annualized cost of the surveys, over the 36 month period is approximately \$53,400. The total

burden in terms of time is 810 hours per State times 6 States, or 4860 hours.

Comments submitted in response to this comment request will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: July 18, 2002.

**Gerard F. Fiala,**

*Administrator, Office of Policy and Research.*  
[FR Doc. 02-18876 Filed 7-24-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**