

administrative and resource issues pertaining to the AMP.

To allow full consideration of information by the TWG members, written notice must be provided to Dennis Kubly, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office, 125 South State Street, Room 6107, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84138; telephone (801) 524-3715; faxogram (801) 524-3858; e-mail at dkubly@uc.usbr.gov (5) days prior to the meeting. Any written comments received will be provided to the AMWG and TWG members prior to the meeting.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis Kubly, telephone (801) 524-3715; faxogram (801) 524-3858; or via e-mail at dkubly@uc.usbr.gov.

Dated: May 19, 2004.

**Dennis Kubly,**

Chief, Adaptive Management Group, Environmental Resources Division, Upper Colorado Regional Office.

[FR Doc. 04-12395 Filed 6-1-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

**ACTION:** 30-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Application to Make and Register a Firearm.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 69, Number 36, on page 8482 on February 24, 2004, allowing for a 60-day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until July 2, 2004. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to The Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs,

Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-5806.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- 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 agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity 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 submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application to Make and Register a Firearm.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: Form Number:* ATF F 1 (5320.1). Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households. Other: Business or other for-profit, State, Local, or Tribal Government.

*Abstract:* The form is used by persons applying to make and register a firearm that falls within the purview of the National Firearms Act. The information supplied by the applicant on the form helps to establish the applicant's eligibility.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* There will be an estimated 1,071 respondents, who will complete the form within approximately 4 hours.

(6) *An estimate of the total burden (in hours) associated with the collection:*

There are an estimated 4,284 total burden hours associated with this collection.

*If additional information is required contact:* Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 1600, Patrick Henry Building, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 26, 2004.

**Brenda E. Dyer,**

Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 04-12402 Filed 6-1-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-54,080]

#### Accenture LLP, Oaks, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of March 15, 2004, petitioners 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 applicable to workers of Accenture LLP, Oaks, Pennsylvania, was signed on February 13, 2004, and published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 2004 (69 FR 11888).

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 TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Accenture LLP, Oaks, Pennsylvania engaged in maintenance and development of software code. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Act.

The petitioner contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of

work performed at the subject facility as a service. The petitioner further compares software programs developed under the auspices of Accenture to Microsoft software packages and computer games which are packaged and sold as "products". Consequently, the petitioner concludes that software developed by the subject group of workers should be considered a product as well.

A company official was contacted for clarification in regard to the nature of the work performed at the subject facility. The official stated that workers at the subject firm are engaged in application development and maintenance services of a trust accounting software to a customer, which in its turn provides investment processing services for financial institutions. Accenture workers perform application fault fixes, enhancements and modifications. The official further clarified that software developed by the subject group of workers is not recorded on media devices for further distribution. All Accenture activities are performed on the application code residing on customer's mainframe and transferred electronically.

The sophistication of the work involved is not an issue in ascertaining whether the petitioning workers are eligible for trade adjustment assistance, but rather only whether they produced an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Software development and maintenance are not considered production of an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act. Petitioning workers do not produce an "article" within the meaning of the Trade Act of 1974. Formatted electronic databases and codes are not tangible commodities, that is, marketable products, and they are not listed on the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), as classified by the United States International Trade Commission (USITC), Office of Tariff Affairs and Trade Agreements, which describes articles imported to the United States.

To be listed in the HTS, an article would be subject to a duty on the tariff schedule and have a value that makes it marketable, fungible and interchangeable for commercial purposes. Although a wide variety of tangible products are described as articles and characterized as dutiable in the HTS, informational products that could historically be sent in letter form and that can currently be electronically transmitted, are not listed in the HTS. Such products are not the type of products that customs officials inspect

and that the TAA program was generally designed to address. The Department does acknowledge software as a product in cases when the software is recorded and marketed on a physical media device, in which case the process of recording (burning) is considered a production and the physical media device a product.

The petitioner also alleges that imports caused layoffs at the subject firm, asserting that because workers lost their jobs due to a transfer of job functions abroad, petitioning workers should be considered import impacted.

The company official stated that Accenture LLP did transfer a number of junior level Programmer-Analyst positions to Philippines during the relevant time period. However, none of these positions involve any sort of production. The Philippine team of analysts is performing programming activities by remotely accessing mainframe system, which is located in Oaks, Pennsylvania and making changes directly to the software on that system. Informational material that is electronically transmitted is not considered production within the context of TAA eligibility requirements, so there are no imports of products in this instance. Further, as the edited material does not become a product until it is recorded on media device, there was no shift in production of an "article" within the meaning of the Trade Act of 1974.

#### 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 21st day of May, 2004.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 04-12383 Filed 6-1-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-54,002]

#### **Asti, Inc., Transaction Printer Group, Inc., Riverton, Wyoming; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application of March 21, 2004, 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 25, 2004 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 6, 2004 (69 FR 18109).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Asti, Inc., Transaction Printer Group, Inc., Riverton, Wyoming engaged in the production of impact printers, was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 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 impact printers in 2002 and 2003. The respondents reported no increased imports. The subject firm did not increase its reliance on imports of impact printers during the relevant period, nor did it shift production to a foreign source.

The petitioner alleges that the layoffs at the subject firm are attributed to a shift in production from Riverton plant and from another manufacturing facility in Ithaca, New York to Mexico in 1999. To support this statement, the petitioner attached a letter signed by the General Manager of Axiohm dated July 28, 1999 which announces a shift of manufacturing operations from the