has determined that it cannot reasonably comply with the normal clearance procedures under this part because normal clearance procedures are reasonably likely to prevent or disrupt the collection of information. Therefore, OMB approval has been requested by November 21, 2001. If granted, the emergency approval is only valid for 180 days. ALL comments and/or questions pertaining to this pending request for emergency approval MUST be directed to OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Ms. Karen Lee, Department of Justice Desk Officer, 725—17th Street, NW., Suite 10235, Washington, DC 20503. Comments regarding the emergency submission of this information collection may also be submitted via facsimile to Ms. Lee at 202–395–6974.

During the first 60 days of this same period, a regular review of this information collection is also being undertaken. During the regular review period, the INS requests written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning this information collection. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until January 22, 2002. During 60-day regular review, ALL comments and suggestions, or questions regarding additional information, to include obtaining a copy of the information collection instrument with instructions, should be directed to Mr. Richard A. Sloan, 202–514–3291, Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 4034, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information 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 agencies 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 collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection: Approval of a new information collection.*

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for T Nonimmigrant Status; Application for Immediate Family Member of T–1 Recipient; and Declaration of Law Enforcement Officer for Victim of Trafficking in Persons.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Forms I–914, I–914 Supplement A, and I–914 Supplement B. Service Center Operations, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals and Households. This application incorporates information pertinent to eligibility under the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386) and a request for employment. The information on all three parts of the form will be used by the Service to determine whether applicants meet the eligibility requirements for certain immigration benefits.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 8,750 I–914 responses at 2.25 hours per response; 18,750 I–914 Supplement A responses at 1 hour per response; and 7,000 I–914 Supplement B responses at .50 hours per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 41,938 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, 601 D Street, NW., Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Richard A. Sloan,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[FR Doc. 01–28899 Filed 11–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of November, 2001.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determination for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–39,127; Trumark, Inc., Lansing, MI

TA–W–40,252; Blue Ridge Textile Printers, Statesville, NC

TA–W–39,347; Capco Machinery Systems, Inc., Roanoke, VA

TA–W–39,840; Mini Lace, Inc., Hialeah, FL

TA–W–39,866; Halsey Drug Co., Inc., Brooklyn, NY

TA–W–39,446; Morgan Machine Co, Fulton, MO

TA–W–39,118, TKG International Corp., Macon GA

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–40,164; Rayovac Portage Plant, Portage, WI
TA–W–39,842; Dallas Semiconductor, Dallas, TX
TA–W–40,086; Mail Well Envelope Co., Portland, OR
TA–W–39,099; ABC Rail, Calera, AL
TA–W–39,725; General Mills, Snacks Div., Carlisle, PA
TA–W–40,094; Heraeus Quartztech, Buford, GA

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–40,002; PDS Railcar Services, Port Huron, MI
TA–W–40,318; Private Manufacturing, Inc., El Paso, TX
TA–W–39,781; American Components, Inc., Research and Development, Dandridge, TN

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name and location of each determination references the impact date for all workers of such determination.

TA–W–39,404; Empire Specialty Steel, Inc., Formerly Known as Al Tech Specialty Steel, Dunkirk, NY: June 19, 2001.
TA–W–39,879; Northwest Wood Products, Inc., Kettle Falls, WA: August 7, 2000.
TA–W–39,444; Kennecott Utah Copper Corp., Utah Mining Division, Bingham Canyon, UT: June 1, 2000.
TA–W–39,587; Grote Industries, LLC, Madison, IN: June 15, 2000.
TA–W–40,155; Burle Industries, Inc., Lancaster, PA: September 26, 2000.
TA–W–39,875; Maida Development Co., Hampton, VA: August 9, 2000.
TA–W–39,122; J and L Specialty Steel, Inc., Midland, PA: April 11, 2000.
TA–W–40,112; Loparex, West Chicago, IL: September 18, 2000.
TA–W–39,415; Tyco International, White City, OR: May 22, 2000.
TA–W–39,521; Kleinert's, Inc., Elba, AL: April 1, 2001.
TA–W–40,105; CTS Reeves, Frequency Products, Sandwich, IL: August 21, 2000.
TA–W–40,144; Pea Ridge Iron Ore Co., Sullivan, MO: September 14, 2000.
TA–W–40,102; Joplin Manufacturing, Inc., Joplin, MO: September 3, 2000.
TA–W–39,884; VF Playwear, Inc., Centerville, AL: August 2, 2000.
TA–W–40,051 & A; Prime Tanning, Rochester, NH and Berwick, ME: September 4, 2000.
TA–W–40,134 & A; Commodore Hat, New York, New York and Adamstown, PA: September 5, 2000.
TA–W–40,214; Intermetro Industries, Wilkes Barre, PA: September 28, 2000.
TA–W–39,949; Eaton Corp., Shelbyville, TN: August 13, 2000.
TA–W–40,008; Summit Circuits, Inc., Fort Wayne, IN: August 28, 2000.
TA–W–39,818; CMI Industries, Inc., Clarksville Plant Including Workers of Defender Services, Inc., Clarksville, GA: July 27, 2000.
TA–W–39,851; Barko Hydraulics, LLC, Superior, WI: August 2, 2000.
TA–W–39,736, A & B; Air-Way Manufacturing Co., Plant #1, Olivet, MI, Plant #2, Olivet, MI and Edgerton, OH: July 21, 2000.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the month of November, 2001.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

(2) that sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) that imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA–TAA–04768; Trumark, Inc., Lansing, MI
NAFTA–TAA–05331; Rayovac, Portage Plant, Portage, WI
NAFTA–TAA–05033; Blue Ridge Textile Printers, Statesville, NC
NAFTA–TAA–05369; Garan Manufacturing, Ozark, AR
NAFTA–TAA–05250; Motorola, Atlanta Order Fulfillment Center (AOFC), Suwanee, GA
NAFTA–TAA–05463; C-Mac Quartz Crystals, Inc., div. Of C-Mac of America, Mechanicsburg, PA
NAFTA–TAA–04935; Tyco International, White City, OR
NAFTA–TAA–04674; SLI Product Lighting, Mullins, SC
NAFTA–TAA–05449; Ruppe Hosiery, Inc., Kings Mountain, NC

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

NAFTA–TAA–05390; General Electric Capital, Card Services, Bloomington, MN
NAFTA–TAA–05290; PDS Railcar Services, Port Huron, MI
NAFTA–TAA–05457; Private Manufacturing, Inc., El Paso, TX

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–05408; VF Imagewear (West), Inc., Wartburg, TN: October 5, 2000
NAFTA–TAA–05407; VF Imagewear (West), Inc., Lillington, NC: October 8, 2000
NAFTA–TAA–05168; CMI Industries, Inc., Clarksville Plant, Clinton Fabrics Div., Clarksville, GA: July 24, 2000
NAFTA–TAA–05254; Barko Hydraulics, LLC, Superior, WI: August 2, 2000
NAFTA–TAA–05186; Lancer Partnership, Ltd, Screw Machine Department, San Antonio, TX: July 27, 2001.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of November, 2001. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: November 13, 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–28976 Filed 11–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,679 and NAFTA–04608]

Kazoo, Inc. San Antonio, TX; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of April 12, 2001, the 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) under petition TA–W–38,679 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA) under petition NAFTA–4608. The TAA denial notice applicable to workers of Kazoo, Inc., San Antonio, Texas, was signed on March 12, 2001 and will soon be published in the **Federal Register**. The NAFTA–TAA denial notice applicable to workers of Kazoo, Inc., San Antonio, Texas, was signed on March 12, 2001 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 5, 2001 (66 FR 18118).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Kazoo, Inc., San Antonio, Texas engaged in cutting fabric, was denied because the ''contribution importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) 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 subject firm did not increase their imports of cut fabric. Sales at the subject firm increased during 2000. The subject firm transferred their cutting operations to another domestic facility.

The NAFTA–TAA petition for the same workers 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 cut fabric like and directly competitive with what the subject plant produced from Mexico or Canada, nor was the cutting operation shifted from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioner alleges that the company shifted the cutting operation at Mexico. The petitioner attached selected letters of recommendation which depicts a shift in production in Mexico. The company was contacted and confirmed that the cutting operation was not shifted to Mexico, nor was the cutting operation contracted out to any Mexican contractor.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law 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 29th day of October, 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–28984 Filed 11–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,550]

Pottstown Precision Casting, Inc./Harvard Industries, Inc. formerly/known/as Doehler Jarvis Stowe, PA; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On August 15, 2001, 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 August 29, 2001 (66 FR 45698).

The Department initially denied TAA to workers of Pottstown Precision Casting, Inc./Harvard Industries, Inc., formerly known as Doehler Jarvis, Stowe, Pennsylvania because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The workers at the subject firm were engaged in employment related to the production of automotive components.

The petition asserted that selected customers of the subject plant imported various automotive component parts, contributing importantly to the worker separations.

On reconsideration, the Department surveyed all selected customers (as supplied by the petitioner) of the subject firm regarding their purchases of products (as depicted by the petitioners application) like and directly competitive to what the subject plant produced during the relevant period. The Department contacted all customers as selected by the petitioner, all customers responded. The survey revealed that imports were negligible during the relevant period. The survey also revealed that the closure of the plant forced customers to seek other manufacturers of products like and directly competitive with what the subject plant produced.

The survey further indicated that customers of the subject firm purchased subject plant components, further processed the product and then exported some parts to foreign sources. The foreign sources integrated the parts into finished products.

The petitioner further asserted that the subject plant was under an existing TAA certification (TA–W–38,550) that expired on March 5, 2001. The customer of that certification was contacted and reported that only a negligible portion of the components (stators) were imported during the relevant period of the current investigation.

Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance and NAFTA–TAA for workers and former workers of Pottstown Precision Casting, Inc./Harvard Industries, Inc., formerly known as Doehler Jarvis, Stowe, Pennsylvania.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of October, 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–28983 Filed 11–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M