

Edgar A. Domench, Deputy Assistant Director, Field Operations (East).

Sherry A. Mahoney,

Acting Executive Secretary, Senior Executive Resources Board.

[FR Doc. 03-16997 Filed 7-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AR-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 60-day notice of information collection under review; extension of a currently approved collection; requirements: data collection application for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) Program.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics 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 collected is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for "sixty days" until September 5, 2003. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Rodney Albert, Deputy Director, State Relations and Assistance Division, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20531.

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:

(1) 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;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information,

including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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

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

(2) *The title of the form/collection:* Requirements: Data Collection Application for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* New collection; Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State. Public Law 105-119, November 26, 1997, Making Appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1998, and for subsequent funded fiscal years.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* Fifty-six (56) respondents will complete a 1-hour follow-up information form for each unit of local government receiving JAIBG funds and on funds retained by the State for program expenditure.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated total burden hours associated with this information collection 4,200.

For Further Information Contact: Ms. 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: June 30, 2003.

Brenda E. Dyer,

Deputy Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 03-16998 Filed 7-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,288 & NAFTA-6104]

International Truck and Engine Corp., a Subsidiary of Navistar International Corp., Springfield, Ohio; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

On May 9, 2003, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 2003 (68 FR 32124).

The Department initially denied trade adjustment assistance to workers of International Truck and Engine Corporation, a subsidiary of Navistar International Corporation, Springfield, Ohio because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) and section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974 were not met. The TAA investigation revealed that criterion (3) was not met; the company did not import medium, heavy or severe service trucks and aggregate U.S. imports of medium, heavy, and severe service trucks decreased during the relevant period. The NAFTA-TAA petition for the same worker group was denied because criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) of section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. The subject firm did not import medium, heavy, or severe service trucks, nor was production of medium, heavy, or severe service trucks shifted from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

On reconsideration, as requested by the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Workers of America—UAW, Region 2B, and Local Unions 402 and 658, the Department considered several allegations and supporting documentation provided by the union to determine if an error had been made in the original negative determination.

The first allegation concerns a shift in production of final cab assembly from the Springfield plant to an affiliated plant in Escobedo, Mexico. To support this allegation, the union provided testimony from two employees who were aware of "knockdown cab assemblies" being shipped to Mexico for final welding.

In response to this allegation, a company official confirmed that the company has cab subassemblies shipped to Mexico from Springfield.

These cabs, used in the production of NGV (New Generation Vehicles) that replaced the company's legacy line of trucks, can be considered directly competitive with those previously welded at the subject facility. However, although the welding of cabs for final truck production at another domestic facility was shifted from Springfield to Mexico, the quantity of cab welding that shifted was and is extremely small relative to cab welding performed at the subject facility, and thus constituted an insignificant portion of overall production at the subject facility.

The union also contends that the Springfield facility and its affiliate in Mexico produce like or directly competitive trucks, and that this fact might be used in support of petitioning workers meeting eligibility requirements for TAA and NAFTA-TAA. To support this claim, the union provides a statement from a company employee who witnessed similar trucks being produced at the Mexican plant, and a set of production schedules that show similar truck lines (4200, 4300, 4400 medium duty trucks) being produced both in Mexico and Springfield.

When contacted in regard to this allegation, the company official confirmed that the Mexican and Springfield plants produce similar trucks. However, the Mexican plant has always produced trucks exclusively for the Mexican market, and its production volume was and is determined exclusively by local consumer demand.

Finally, the union alleged that trucks competitive with those produced in Springfield were imported to the U.S. from Mexico. To support this allegation, they provided a multi-page inventory of truck orders that indicate a large number of trucks sent from the Escobedo facility to the U.S.

A copy of this import inventory was sent to a company official for comment. In his response, it was revealed that the company did in fact import competitive trucks for a brief period in the fall of 2003, as a pre-emptive measure in preparation for a potential strike. The official clarified that the company wanted to make sure that they could meet production orders in the event of a work stoppage and that the Mexican production occurred between September 11 and November 26 of 2002, and that there was a work stoppage at the Springfield facility between October 18 and November 11, 2002. All employees were retained following this stoppage. Further, the Mexican production for this contingency commenced after the relevant period of the investigation. In conclusion the company official confirmed that which

was established in the initial investigation; no production was imported by the company to the U.S. in 2000, 2001, and in January through July of 2002.

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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of June, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-16887 Filed 7-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,432]

Angus Consulting Management, Inc., a Wholly-Owned Subsidiary of Angus Consulting Management, Ltd., Alpharetta, Georgia; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked March 14, 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 applicable to workers of Angus Consulting Management, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Angus Consulting Management, Ltd., Columbus, Ohio was signed on January 27, 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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Angus Consulting

Management, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Angus Consulting Management, Ltd., Columbus, Ohio engaged in activities related to facility management services (operating a boiler plant). The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioners imply that their layoffs were exclusively attributed to the decision of an unaffiliated firm's decision to shift production to Canada and that, consequently, the petitioning workers should be eligible for trade adjustment assistance.

The fact that service workers are dependant on the production of another facility that may be eligible for trade adjustment assistance does not automatically make the service workers eligible for TAA. Before service workers can be considered eligible for TAA, they must be in direct support of an affiliated TAA certified facility. This is not the case for the workers at Angus Consulting Management, Inc.

The petitioners allege that they should be considered eligible for TAA under a certification for workers at Lucent Technologies, Columbus Works, Columbus, Ohio (TA-W-40,256), as, prior to their employ at Angus Consulting Management, they worked at the trade certified firm.

Worker eligibility that is determined by layoffs that occurred at a firm that precedes the last place of employment is determined by the state on an individual basis to determine if the worker(s) meet the various factors under the existing certification during the relevant period.

Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA, namely the worker separations must be caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article and who are currently under certification for TAA.

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 18th day of June, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-16888 Filed 7-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P