Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210 or tofoiarequest@dol.gov. These determinations also are available on the Department’s Web site at http://www.dol.gov/opa under the searchable listing of determinations.

Date: July 7, 2011.

Michael W. Jaffe,
Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2011–18236 Filed 7–19–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–75,067; TA–W–75,076A]

JLG Industries, Inc., Access Segment, a Subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Aerotek, McConnellsburg, PA; JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a Subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, MD; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“Act”), 19 U.S.C. 2273, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 9, 2011, applicable to workers and former workers of JLG Industries, Inc., Access Segment, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, including on-site leased workers from Aerotek, McConnellsburg, Pennsylvania (JLG-McConnellsburg). The workers produce access equipment. The Department’s Notice was published in the Federal Register on March 23, 2011 (76 FR 16449).

At the request of a worker separated from the Hagerstown, Maryland facility, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of JLG-McConnellsburg.

New information supplied by the workers and confirmed by JLG Industries, Inc. revealed that the Hagerstown, Maryland facility operated in conjunction with JLG-McConnellsburg in the production of access equipment and supplied design engineering, global procurement supply chain, safety, and reliability services used in the production of equipment at JLG-McConnellsburg.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to properly reflect these matters.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–75,067 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of JLG Industries, Inc., Access Segment, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, including on-site leased workers from Aerotek, McConnellsburg, Pennsylvania (TA–W–75,067) and JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, Maryland (TA–W–75,067A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 3, 2011, through March 9, 2013, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on March 9, 2011 through March 9, 2013, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 11th day of July 2011.

Del Min Amy Chen,
Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2011–18239 Filed 7–19–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–74,935]

Husqvarna Turf Care, a Subsidiary of Husqvarna A.B., Beatrice, NE; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On May 3, 2011, the Department of Labor issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of Husqvarna Turf Care, a subsidiary of Husqvarna A.B., Beatrice, Nebraska (subject firm). The Department’s Notice was published in the Federal Register on May 20, 2011 (76 FR 29273). The workers are engaged in activities related to the production of zero turn mowers for commercial users and home owners.

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 initial investigation resulted was based on the findings that Criterion III has not been met because the worker separations are not attributable to increased imports or a shift in production to a foreign country. Rather, the investigation established that the worker separations were attributable to a shift in production to an affiliated facility within the United States, and that the shift is attributable to business considerations unrelated to increased imports.

With regard to the affiliated facility (TA–W–74,418) identified in the petition, the investigation confirmed that the shift by the workers’ firm of computer-aided design (CAD) services to a foreign country was unrelated to the shift in production in this case.

With respect to Section 222(c) of the Act, the investigation revealed that Criterion (2) has not been met because the firm is not a Supplier or Downstream Producer to a firm that employed a worker group eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance. In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that “it has been the intent of Husqvarna Turf Care to progressively move these jobs to another country or countries * * * It has been rumored that he (a line leader) has been given the ultimatum to increase his production or they would move this line to Germany. In addition to this, it was rumored that they had built a new building in Germany * * * and that our PZ line was already running in Germany before our plant had closed.”

In an attachment to the request, another worker stated that “we have reports that some of our jobs have already been moved to foreign soil and that more will be in the future.”

A careful review of the administrative record and additional information obtained by the Department during the reconsideration investigation confirmed that the worker separations are not attributable to increased imports or a shift in production to a foreign country. Rather, the investigation established that the worker separations were attributable to a shift in production to an affiliated facility within the United States, and that all production was moved to Orangeburg, South Carolina. Further, the firm addressed the above-mentioned petitioner allegations, in addition to confirming that separations were attributable to a shift in production to an affiliated facility within the United States, and that all production was moved to Orangeburg, South Carolina.

Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–75,131]

JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, MD; Notice of Termination of Reconsideration Investigation

On April 14, 2011, the Department of Labor (Department) issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for workers and former workers of JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, Maryland. The Department’s Notice of affirmative determination was published in the Federal Register on April 25, 2011 (76 FR 22922).

On July 11, 2011, the Department issued an amended certification applicable to workers and former workers of JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, Maryland. The Department’s Notice of amended certification will soon be published in the Federal Register.

Because the petitioning group of workers is covered by a certification (TA–W–75,076A) which expires on March 9, 2013, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the reconsideration investigation has been terminated.

Conclusion

After careful review of the administrative record and the findings of the reconsideration investigation, I am terminating the investigation of the petition for worker adjustment assistance filed on behalf of workers and former workers of JLG Industries, Inc., Access Division, a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, Hagerstown, Maryland.

Signed in Washington, DC, on this 11th day of July 2011.

Del Min Amy Chen,
Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

FR Doc. 2011–18240 Filed 7–19–11; 8:45 am
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NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice of a request for comments regarding a new information collection.

SUMMARY: As part of a Federal Government-wide effort to streamline the process to seek feedback from the public on service delivery, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has submitted a Generic Information Collection Request (Generic ICR): “Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery” to OMB for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA).

DATES: Comments must be submitted August 19, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted to Mr. Nicholas A. Fraser, Desk Officer for NARA, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; fax: 202–395–3167; or electronically mailed to Nicholas.A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information, please contact Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301–837–1694 or fax number 301–713–7409.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Title: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery.

Abstract: The information collection activity will garner qualitative customer and stakeholder feedback in an efficient, timely manner, in accordance with the Administration’s commitment to improving service delivery. By qualitative feedback we mean information that provides useful insights on perceptions and opinions, but are not statistical surveys that yield quantitative results that can be generalized to the population of study. This feedback will provide insights into customer or stakeholder perceptions, experiences and expectations, provide an early warning of issues with service, or focus attention on areas where communication, training or changes in operations might improve delivery of products or services. These collections will allow for ongoing, collaborative and actionable communications between the Agency and its customers and stakeholders. It will also allow feedback to contribute directly to the improvement of program management.

Feedback collected under this generic clearance will provide useful information, but it will not yield data that can be generalized to the overall population. This type of generic clearance for qualitative information will not be used for quantitative information collections that are designed to yield reliably actionable results, such as monitoring trends over time or documenting program performance. Such data uses require more rigorous designs that address: the target population to which generalizations will be made, the sampling frame, the sample design (including stratification and clustering), the precision requirements or power calculations that justify the proposed sample size, the expected response rate, methods for assessing potential non-response bias, the protocols for data collection, and any testing procedures that were or will be undertaken prior to fielding the study. Depending on the degree of influence the results are likely to have, such collections may still be eligible for submission for other generic mechanisms that are designed to yield quantitative results.

The Agency received no comments in response to the 60-day notice published in the Federal Register of May 3, 2011 (76 FR 24920).

Below we provide NARA’s projected average estimates for the next three years:

Type of Review: New Collection.

Affected Public: Individuals and households, businesses and organizations, State, Local or Tribal Government.

Average Expected Annual Number of activities: 20.
Respondents: 25,000.
Annual responses: 1.
Frequency of Response: Once per request.
Average minutes per response: 30.
Burden hours: 12,500.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid...