

Reliant Bolt, Inc. All workers were separated at Reliant Fastener when the facility closed in November 2002. The workers were engaged in the production of fasteners for industrial and automobile industries.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to include workers of Reliant Fastener, Rock Falls, Illinois.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-50,001 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Reliant Bolt, Inc., Bedford Park, Illinois (TA-W-50,001) and all workers of Reliant Fastener, Rock Falls, Illinois (TA-W-50,001A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 4, 2001, through December 10, 2004, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 5th day of February 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8339 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,989]

Sara Lee Bakery Group, Eau Claire, WI; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 26, 2003 in response to a worker petition filed by Bakery, Confectionery, Tobacco Workers and Grain Millers Union, Twin Cities Local 22 on behalf of workers at Sara Lee Bakery Group, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 25th day of March 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8344 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,047]

Search Resources, Workers Employed at Blandin Paper Co., Grand Rapids, MN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 4, 2003 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers of Search Resources employed at Blandin Paper Company, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

An active certification covering the petitioning group of workers is already in effect (TA-W-50,598, as amended). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 26th day of March 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8346 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,074]

Summit Manufacturing, LLC, West Hazelton, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of February 25, 2003, a petitioner 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 February 3, 2003 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 2003 (68 FR 8619).

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 Summit Manufacturing, LLC, West Hazelton, Pennsylvania engaged in the production of steel telecommunications poles, steel pole modifications, cellular poles, sign and lighting poles, and flag poles 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 telecommunications poles, steel pole modifications, cellular poles, sign and lighting poles, and flag poles in 2000, 2001 and 2002. None of the respondents reported increasing imports while decreasing purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period. Imports did not contribute importantly to layoffs at the subject firm.

The petitioner alleges that the imports of steel, especially from Canada increased from 2001 to 2002.

Imports of steel are not "like or directly competitive" with the products produced (steel telecommunications poles, steel pole modifications, cellular poles, sign and lighting poles, and flag poles) by the subject plant, thus this allegation is not relevant to the investigation.

The petitioner's request for reconsideration further states that the investigation took longer than the 40 days required to complete the investigation and, because of this, the workers of the subject plant should be certified.

The Department makes every effort to conduct a TAA investigation within the prescribed 40 day period. A review of the initial investigation shows that the responses by the company and customers took longer than normal. The Department bases its findings on facts after it receives all requested data necessary in order to make an accurate decision, regardless of timeframes.

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 in Washington, DC, this 18th day of March 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8352 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,889]

United Container Machinery, Glen Arm, MD; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application January 1, 2003, a petitioner 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 November 29, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on December 23, 2002 (67 FR 78257).

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 petition for the workers of United Container Machinery, Glen Arm, Maryland 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 customers of the workers' firm. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imported machinery for corrugated boxes.

The petitioner states that the subject firm workers were previously certified for trade adjustment assistance in 1998, and thus appears to allege that they should be considered eligible currently.

The Department considers import impact in terms of the relevant period of the current investigation; therefore import impact as established in a

previous investigation that is outside the relevant period is irrelevant.

The petitioner also states that the company did not file a new petition on behalf of subject firm workers when the previous certification expired.

This fact has no bearing on eligibility of subject firm workers for trade adjustment assistance.

The petitioner asserts that an affiliate of the subject firm imports competitive products from Hungary.

In response to this allegation, a company official clarified that United Container Machinery did merge with another company in the late summer of 2002, and that the merger did include the acquisition of a Hungarian facility. He also verified that the foreign firm has imported a small percentage of their production to the United States for some time; however, imports of products produced from this facility have not increased since the merger, and so have not contributed to layoffs at the subject firm.

The petitioner asserts that a foreign competitor sells competitive products to at least two customers of the subject firm.

When contacted about this allegation, the company official stated that the two companies mentioned comprised a very small percentage of the subject firm's sales declines. In fact, according to the company official, the layoffs were not brought about by sales and production declines, but rather by a shift in production to two affiliated domestic facilities.

The petitioner also stated that United Container Machinery acted as a selling agent of competitive machinery and that this role "in the long run affected some of our prospective sales."

The company official that commented on this stated that the subject firm had taken part in a partnership with several foreign firms to sell competitive corrugated box machinery, receiving a commission for their services. However, the imports resulting from the partnership between the subject firm and the foreign firms constituted a very small amount relative to production at the Glen Arm facility. The company official further clarified that imports declined for the twelve months ending August of 2002, when the partnership ceased.

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 in Washington, DC this 25th day of March 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8349 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Reestablishment of Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA)

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Reestablishment of the Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA).

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that after consultation with the General Services Administration, the Department of Labor has determined that the reestablishment of a national advisory committee on apprenticeship is necessary and in the public interest. Accordingly, the Employment and Training Administration has chartered the Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA) which succeeds the Federal Committee on Registered Apprenticeship (FCRA). The charter for the FCRA expired on January 19, 2003. The current charter was signed February 13, 2003, and will expire two years from that date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Anthony Swoope, Administrator, Office of Apprenticeship Training, Employer and Labor Services, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-4671, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 693-2796, (this is not a toll-free number).

Signed in Washington, DC, this 1st day of April 2003.

Emily Stover DeRocco,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-8337 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 03-036]

Notice of Information Collection Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).