

continuing the certification for TA-W-31,832 would serve no purpose and the certification is terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 20th day of March 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96-8079 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,410]

**Springtown Knitwear Incorporated, Formerly Spring City Knitting, Cartersville, Georgia; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on October 27, 1995, applicable to all workers at Springtown Knitwear, Incorporated, located in Cartersville, Georgia. The notice was published in the Federal Register on November 9, 1995 (60 FR 56619).

At the request of the State Agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information received from the State Agency shows that after the closure of Spring City Knitting in August 1994, Springtown Knitwear began operations in the same building, with many of the former workers of Spring City Knitting. The workers were engaged in the production of knitwear. Springtown Knitwear closed in August 1995.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of the subject firm who were adversely affected by increased imports. The Department is amending the certification to cover the former Spring City Knitting workers.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-31,410 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of the Springtown Knitwear Incorporated, formerly Spring City Knitting, Cartersville, Georgia who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 31, 1994 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 20th day of March 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96-8078 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

**Job Training Partnership Act; Lower Living Standard Income Level**

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Notice of determination of lower living standard income level.

**SUMMARY:** The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) provides that the term "economically disadvantaged" may be defined as 70 percent of the "lower living standard income level" (LLSIL). To provide the most accurate data possible, the Department of Labor is issuing revised figures for the LLSIL. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** This notice is effective on April 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Ms. Diane Mayronne, Office of Employment and Training Programs, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, Room N-4463, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Diane Mayronne, Telephone: 202-219-5305 (this is not a toll free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** It is a purpose of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) "to afford job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals . . . who are in special need of such training to obtain productive employment." JTPA Section 2; see 20 CFR 626.1 and 626.3(b). JTPA Section 4(8) defines, for the purposes of JTPA eligibility, the term "economically disadvantaged" in part by reference to the "lower living standard income level" (LLSIL). See 20 CFR 626.5.

The LLSIL figures published in this notice shall be used to determine whether an individual is economically disadvantaged for applicable JTPA purposes. JTPA Section 4(16) defines the LLSIL as follows:

The term "lower living standard income level" means that income level (adjusted for regional, metropolitan, urban, and rural differences and family size) determined annually by the Secretary [of Labor] based on the most recent "lower living family budget" issued by the Secretary.

The most recent lower living family budget was issued by the Secretary in the fall of 1981. Using those data, the 1981 LLSIL was determined for programs under the now-repealed Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The four-person urban family budget estimates previously published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) provided the basis for the Secretary to determine the LLSIL for training and employment program operators. BLS terminated the four-person family budget series in 1982,

after publication of the Fall 1981 estimates.

Under JTPA, the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) published the 1995 updates to the LLSIL in the Federal Register of April 25, 1995. 60 FR 20283. ETA has again updated the LLSIL to reflect cost of living increases for 1995 by applying the percentage change in the December 1995 Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CIP-U), compared with the December 1994 CPI-U, to each of the April 25, 1995, LLSIL figures. Those updated figures for a family of four are listed in Table 1 below by region for both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. Since eligibility is determined by family income at 70 percent of the LLSIL, pursuant to Section 4(8) of JTPA, those figures are listed below as well.

Jurisdictions included in the various regions, based generally on Census Divisions of the U.S. Department of Commerce, are as follows:

	Northeast
Connecticut	New York
Maine	Pennsylvania
Massachusetts	Rhode Island
New Hampshire	Vermont
New Jersey	Virginia Islands
	Midwest
Illinois	Missouri
Indiana	Nebraska
Iowa	North Dakota
Kansas	Ohio
Michigan	South Dakota
Minnesota	Wisconsin
	South
Alabama	Kentucky
American Samoa	Louisiana
Arkansas	Marshall Islands
Delaware	Maryland
District of Columbia	Mississippi
Florida	Micronesia
Georgia	North Carolina
Northern Marianas	Tennessee
Oklahoma	Texas
Palau	Virginia
Puerto Rico	West Virginia
South Carolina	
	West
Arizona	New Mexico
California	Oregon
Colorado	Utah
Idaho	Washington
Montana	Wyoming
Nevada	

Additionally, separate figures have been provided for Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam as indicated in Table 2 below.

For Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, the 1996 figures were updated by creating a "State Index" based on the ratio of the urban change in the State (using Anchorage for Alaska and Honolulu for Hawaii and Guam) compared to the