In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the subject worker group must be certified eligible to apply for TAA. Since the subject workers are denied eligibility to apply for TAA, the workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

Conclusion

After careful reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of American Racing Equipment, LLC, Denver, Colorado.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of April, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–8870 Filed 4–16–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–71,634]

Yale Industrial Trucks-PGH, Inc. Monroeville, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received March 16, 2010, 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 Department's Notice of determination was issued on March 3, 2010 and will soon be published in the **Federal Register.**

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 negative determination of the TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at Yale Industrial Trucks-PGH, Inc., Monroeville, Pennsylvania, was based on the findings that: The subject firm had not shifted abroad forklift truck sales and maintenance services or imported forklift truck sales and maintenance services during the relevant period; the declining customers of the subject firm had not obtained truck sales and maintenance services from foreign firms during the relevant period; and the workers did not produce an article or supply a service that was used by a firm with TAA-certified workers in the production of an article or supply of a service that was the basis for TAA-certification.

The petitioner stated that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA because some of that firm's largest customers, who are TAA-certified, have cut back production in some plants and shut down production at other plants because of foreign steel imports and have consequently sent back a large number of the fork lift trucks leased and serviced by the subject firm. Moreover, the petitioner alleged that there were many fork lift truck companies selling foreign-made fork lift trucks.

The initial investigation revealed that the secondary certification that the petitioner is seeking is not possible because the subject firm provided tools and related services used in production but not component parts, as required by Section 222(d) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(d).

Furthermore, during the initial investigation the Department surveyed the subject firm's major declining customers regarding their purchases of forklift trucks and maintenance services during the relevant period. The survey revealed no imports of forklift trucks or related maintenance services.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

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 1st day of April, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–8874 Filed 4–16–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–72,103]

Terex USA, LLC, Cedar Rapids, IA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 8, 2010, the State of Iowa Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Coordinator requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for TAA applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The Notice of negative determination was signed on February 3, 2010. The Department's Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 2010 (74 FR 11925).

The petitioner states in the request for reconsideration that the initial customer survey was limited to only the largest customer of the subject firm and that perhaps many of the subject firm's customers are purchasing imports of products like those produced by the subject firm, and that such purchasing of imports by many small customers could have brought about the worker separations at the subject firm.

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination, which was based on the finding that shifts of production of crushing, screening, and paving equipment (types of construction equipment) did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and that a major portion of the sales decline of the subject firm can

be attributed to a loss of exports and thus is not affected by imports.

During the initial investigation, the subject firm provided sales and contact information for its major declining customers: one domestic customer and three foreign customers. The sole domestic customer constituted 16 percent of the sales decline experienced by the subject firm and the three foreign customers constituted 72 percent of the subject firm's sales decline.

The Department confirmed during the initial investigation that the three foreign customers were purchasing finished articles and not component parts of construction equipment from the subject firm, and determined that the subject firm's declining sales with the three foreign customers was loss of export business by the subject firm. Further, during the initial investigation, the Department had collected aggregate data that shows that imports into the United States of agricultural and construction machinery decreased by almost 40 percent during the relevant period.

Because the export losses and the losses to the sole domestic customer account for 88 percent of the decline in sales for the subject firm and there were decreasing aggregate imports of construction equipment, the Department determined that the customer survey conducted during the initial investigation was appropriate.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

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 1st day of April 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–8875 Filed 4–16–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Work Reserved for Performance by Federal Government Employees; Correction

AGENCY: Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice; Correction.

SUMMARY: The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is making corrections to the addresses and instructions for submitting and viewing public comments on the Proposed Policy Letter "Work Reserved for Performance by Federal Government Employees" (75 FR 16188–16197, March 31, 2010). The **ADDRESSES** section and updated Web site below should be used in place of those previously published in the March 31, 2010 notice. All other information from the March 31st notice, including the June 1, 2010, deadline for submission of comments, remains unchanged. The full text of the original notice is available at *http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/2010–7329.htm.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mathew Blum, OFPP, (202) 395–4953 or *mblum@omb.eop.gov.*

Corrections

In the **Federal Register** on March 31, 2010, beginning at the top of page 16189, correct the **ADDRESSES** to read:

ADDRESSES: All comments should be submitted via one of the following methods:

- *Online: http://www.regulations.gov.*
- *Fax:* 202–395–5105.
- *Mail:* Office of Federal Procurement Policy, *Attn:* Mathew Blum, New Executive Office Building, Room 9013, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.
- *Instructions:* Please submit comments only and include your name, company name (if any), and cite "Proposed OFPP Policy Letter" in all correspondence. All comments received will be posted, without change, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* without redaction, so commenters should not include information that they do not wish to be posted (for example because they consider it personal or business confidential).

In the **Federal Register** on March 31, 2010, correct the hyperlink in the last sentence on page 16189 to read:

For a copy of public comments, go to *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/procurement_gov_contracting/public_comments.pdf.*

Daniel I. Gordon,

Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

[FR Doc. 2010–8824 Filed 4–16–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee On Reactor Safeguards (ACRS); Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee On Plant License Renewal

The ACRS Subcommittee on Plant License Renewal will hold a meeting on May 5, 2010, Room T–2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, May 5, 2010—8:30 a.m. until 12 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss the Cooper Nuclear Station License Renewal Application and the associated Safety Evaluation Report (SER) with Open Items prepared by the staff. The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, Nebraska Public Power District, and other interested persons regarding this matter. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the Full Committee.

Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Official (DFO), Mrs. Kathy Weaver (Telephone 301–415–6236 or E-mail *Kathy.Weaver@nrc.gov*) five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty-five hard copies of each presentation or handout should be provided to the DFO thirty minutes before the meeting. In addition, one electronic copy of each presentation should be emailed to the DFO one day before the meeting. If an electronic copy cannot be provided within this timeframe, presenters should provide the DFO with a CD containing each presentation at least 30 minutes before the meeting. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public. Detailed procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the **Federal**