

services. The five responses provided a combined total of 10,243 beds. Environmental impacts of each facility have been evaluated in a combined Environmental Assessment (EA) based primarily on information provided by the Offerors. The EA evaluated the full effects of the potentially available of 10,243 inmate beds.

Background Information

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Council of Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), BOP has prepared EA to contract with multiple public and private corporations to house approximately 7,000 federal, low-security, adult male, non-U.S. citizen, criminal aliens in existing Contractor-Owned/Contractor-Operated facilities located in Arizona, California, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, or Texas. Five existing facilities, have been offered in response to the BOP's solicitation for services.

The five responses provided a combined total of 10,243 beds. The EA was published on December 12, 2006, for a 30-day comment period and prepared pursuant to NEPA.

Project Information

The BOP is responsible for carrying out judgements of the Federal courts whenever a period of confinement is ordered. Subsequently, the mission of the BOP is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost-efficient, and appropriately secure, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens. Approximately 162,200 inmates are currently housed within the 114 federal correctional institutions that have levels of security ranging from minimum to maximum; a number exceeding the combined rated capacities of all federal correctional facilities. Measures being taken to manage the growth of the federal inmate population include construction of new institutions, acquisition and adaptation of facilities originally intended for other purposes, expansion and improvement of existing correctional facilities, and expanded use of contract beds. Adding capacity through these various means allows the BOP to work toward the long-term goal of reduced system-wide crowding.

Alternatives Considered

The No Action alternative is defined as a decision not to proceed with the proposed action to award a contract to

house the described population. Instead, the BOP would continue the current and long-standing arrangement whereby low-security, adult male, criminal alien inmate populations are housed in facilities owned and operated by the BOP as well as with state, local, and private residential reentry centers and in alternative confinement. Adoption of the No Action alternative would avoid the potential impacts associated with use of a Contractor-Owned/Contractor-Operated correctional facility to house low-security, federal inmates.

Under the No Action alternative, the beneficial impacts on local and regional economies resulting from operational budget expenditures at potentially vacant or underutilized correctional facilities would not occur. The loss of jobs is likely at some facilities under the No Action alternative. The No Action alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the BOP's Action alternative and would not address the demand for additional capacity to house the increasing federal inmate population.

Five locations were evaluated in the EA. Because any given facility could be awarded a number of inmates up to its capacity, potential impacts at each facility were evaluated based upon its maximum possible capacity. The facilities and respective inmate populations evaluated were:

Big Spring Correctional Center (BSCC), located in Big Springs, Texas, evaluated for its maximum capacity under this action to provide 3,307 beds.

Eden Detention Center (EDC), Eden, Texas, evaluated for its maximum capacity to provide 1,556 beds.

Giles W. Dalby Correction Center (GDCC) of Post, Texas, evaluated for its maximum capacity to provide 1,670 beds.

Pine Prairie Correctional Facility (PPCF), Pine Prairie, Louisiana, evaluated for its maximum capacity to provide 1,090 beds.

Reeves County Detention Center (RCDC), located in Pecos, Texas, evaluated for its maximum capacity to provide 2,620 beds.

The impacts of the Action alternative on the environment were considered in an EA published on December 12, 2006, and prepared pursuant to NEPA. The EA evaluated the full effects of the potentially available of 10,243 inmate beds. Review of the EA with the necessary mitigation has led to a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), as that phrase is defined pursuant to NEPA. The Action alternative would result in negligible

impacts to public services of host communities. There would be no significant adverse impacts to surrounding land uses, utility systems, traffic patterns or other community considerations. No significant adverse on-site impacts as defined pursuant to NEPA are anticipated as a result of the Action alternative. After review of the comments received from interested agencies and local citizens concerning the EA, the BOP signed a FONSI for the Action alternative.

Notice of Availability

BOP provided written notices of the availability of the EA in five newspapers with local and regional circulations, and through five local public libraries. The BOP also distributed approximately 175 copies (each) of the EA to Federal and State agencies, state and local governments, elected officials, interested organizations, and individuals.

Availability of The Finding of No Significant Impact

The Finding of No Significant Impact and other information regarding this project are available upon request. To request a copy of the Finding of No Significant Impact, please contact: Pamela J. Chandler, Chief, or Issac J. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist, Site Selection and Environmental Review Branch, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 320 First Street, NW., Washington, DC 20534. Tel: 202–514–6470/Fax: 202–616–6024/E-mail: pchandler@bop.gov or igaston@bop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pamela J. Chandler, or Issac J. Gaston, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Dated: January 26, 2007.

Issac J. Gaston,

Site Selection Specialist, Site Selection and Environmental Review Branch.

[FR Doc. E7–1624 Filed 2–1–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–5–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,197]

C&C Smith Lumber Company, Inc., Summerhill, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated November 29, 2006, a company official 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 2, 2006, and published in the **Federal Register** on November 22, 2006 (71 FR 67650).

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 C&C Smith Lumber Company, Inc., Summerhill, Pennsylvania engaged in production of furniture parts was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met, nor was there a shift in production from that firm to a foreign country. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed no imports of furniture parts in 2004, 2005 and January through September 2006. The subject firm did not import furniture parts nor did they shift production to a foreign country during the relevant period.

The petitioner states that the affected workers lost their jobs as a direct result of a loss of customers in the furniture industry. The petitioner alleges that major declining customers of the subject firm which manufacture furniture decreased purchases of various furniture parts and components from the C&C Smith Lumber Company, Inc., Summerhill, Pennsylvania because their business was in its turn negatively impacted by increased imports of furniture. Therefore, the petitioner concludes that because sales and production of furniture parts at the subject firm have been negatively impacted by increasing presence of foreign imports of furniture on the market, workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA.

In order to establish import impact, the Department must consider imports that are like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm. The Department conducted a survey of the subject firm's major declining customers regarding their purchases of furniture parts and components. The survey

revealed that the declining customers did not increase their imports of furniture parts and components during the relevant period.

Imports of furniture cannot be considered like or directly competitive with furniture parts, such as hardwood furniture squares and stair parts, produced by C&C Smith Lumber Company, Inc., Summerhill, Pennsylvania and imports of furniture are not relevant in this investigation.

Upon further review of the previous investigation and further contact with the company official, the Department requested an additional list of customers in order to conduct a fuller investigation to determine whether there were any imports of furniture parts and components during the relevant time period.

The Department conducted a further survey of the additional customers regarding their purchases of furniture parts. The survey revealed that none of the respondents reported imports of furniture parts during the relevant time period.

Moreover, the subject firm does not import furniture parts and components and did not shift production of furniture parts and components abroad.

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 day 19th of January, 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-1695 Filed 2-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,277]

Creative Engineering Products, Formerly Known as Carlisle Engineered Products, Belleville Division, a Subsidiary of the Reserve Group, Belleville, MI; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at

Creative Engineering Products, formerly known as Carlisle Engineered Products, Belleville Division, a subsidiary of the Reserve Group, Belleville, Michigan. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-60,277; Creative Engineering Products, Formerly Known as Carlisle Engineered Products, Belleville Division, a Subsidiary of the Reserve Group. Belleville, Michigan (January 18, 2007)

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of January 2007.

Ralph DiBattista,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-1697 Filed 2-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,700]

Quality Staffing Services Working at Filtronic Comtek, Inc., Salisbury, MD; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 4, 2007 in response to a petition filed by a state agency representative on behalf of workers of Quality Staffing Services, working at Filtronic Comtek, Inc., Salisbury, Maryland. The workers at the subject facility produce filters for cell tower base stations.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an earlier petition (TA-W-60,699) filed on January 3, 2007 that is the subject of an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Further investigation in this case would duplicate efforts and serve no purpose; therefore the investigation under this petition has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 18th day of January 2007.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-1696 Filed 2-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P