e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration and the Employment Standards Administration

Title: Attestations by Facilities Employing H–1C Nonimmigrant Aliens as Registered Nurses

OMB Number: 1205–ONew

Frequency: On Occasion

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; State, Local, or Tribal Government

Number of Respondents: 16

Total Annual Responses: 143

Total Burden Hours: 68

Total Burden Cost: (capital/startup: $0

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): $0

Description: The Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999 creates a temporary visa program for nonimmigrant aliens to work as registered nurses. This information collection contains recordkeeping and reporting requirements for those facilities seeking to hire nonresident alien nurses under the program, and information requirements for those persons wishing to file a complaint that a facility has failed to meet the statutory requirements of the Act.

Ira L. Mills,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–21725 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37,633] and [NAFTA–3944]

The Holmes Group, Rival Division, Warrensburg, Missouri; Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated July 20, 2000, petitioners request administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) petition number TA–W–37,633, and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA) petition number NAFTA–3944, applicable to workers and former workers of The Holmes Group, Rival Division, Warrensburg, Missouri. The denial notices were signed on June 29, 2000, and published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2000, TA–W–37,633 (65 FR 45620) and NAFTA–3944 (65 FR 45621).

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.

To support the application for reconsideration, the petitioners provided documents related to planned production and budgeted hours for the Warrensburg plant for 1999, and parts and sub-assemblies that went overseas. The petitioner also states that the subject firm stopped parts production within the last year.

Planned production by the subject firm is not a basis for worker group certification under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. The Department is required to examine sales or production of articles produced by workers of the firm for the time period relevant to the investigation.

During all of 1999 and the early part of 2000, output at the plant was primarily comprised of industrial fans and heaters. Although the company relied on imports of heater components, no worker separations occurred as the result of the company imports. Employees formerly producing components were transferred within the plant to assemble finished heaters. Ultimately, the assembly operations were moved from Warrensburg, Missouri, to other domestic facilities of The Holmes Group.

The workers were denied eligibility to apply for TAA based on the finding that the contributed importantly criterion of the workers group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Layoffs of workers producing heaters at the subject firm were attributable to the company's decision to transfer production to other domestic facilities.

The NAFTA–TAA petition investigation for the same worker group revealed that criteria (3) and (4) of paragraph (a)(1) of Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were not met. The subject firm did not import from Mexico or Canada, articles like or directly competitive with those produced by workers of the firm. There was no shift in production from the Warrensburg plant to Mexico or Canada.

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 14th day of August 2000.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–21730 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

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 August, 2000.

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 Determinations 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–37,764; Precision Headed Products, Formerly Mascotech

Forming Technologies, Ypsilanti, MI

TA–W–37,593; Pennzoil-Quaker State Co., Rouseville, PA, A; Oil City, PA, B; Reno, PA, C; Roosevelt, UT, D; Deerfield, OH and E; Rock Hill, SC

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

TA–W–37,886; Racing Champions ERTL, Inc., Dyersville, PA

TA–W–37,678; Packard Bell/NEC, Inc., (PBNEC), NEC Computer Systems Div. (NEC/CSO), Server Product Group, Boxborough, MA

TA–W–37,860; Weatherford Global Compression, Midland, TX

TA–W–37,892; CRH Catering Co., Inc., Connellsville, PA

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

TA–W–37,508; Meritor Automotive, Oshkosh, WI

TA–W–37,658; Cooper Tools, Statesboro, GA

TA–W–37,584; Quebecor World, Inc., St. Paul, MN

TA–W–37,539; Quebecor World, Inc., Nashville, TN and Aurora, IL

TA–W–37,774; Caporale Engraving, Inc., Hackensack, NJ

TA–W–37,883; Corrpro Companies, Inc., Midland, TX

TA–W–37,819; Modern Engineering Co., Inc., Gallman, MS

TA–W–37,861; Modern Engineering Co. A Div. of Victor Equipment Co., Gallman, MS

TA–W–37,638; Wildon Industries, Mt. Bethel, PA

TA–W–37,709; The Boeing Co., St. Louis, MO

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

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–37,804; Kellwood Co., Spencer, WV: May 22, 1999.

TA–W–37,827; The Kym Co., Jackson, GA: June 6, 1999.

TA–W–37,895; DeFarr, Inc., New York, NY: July 7, 1999.

TA–W–37,758; Federal Mogul Corp., Milan, MI: May 23, 1999.

TA–W–37,866; Assembly Service, Inc., El Paso, TX: June 26, 1999.

TA–W–37,595; Humpherys, Inc., Chicago, IL: April 3, 1999.

TA–W–37,684; Colby Footwear, Inc., Gonic, NH: May 4, 1999.

TA–W–37,586; Enefco International Limited, Footwear Subdivision, Auburn, ME: April 7, 1999.

TA–W–37,794; The American Fabrics Co., Tylertown, MS: May 6, 2000

TA–W–37,813; Seton Co., Leather Div, Saxton, PA: June 5, 1999

TA–W–37,907; Indiana Knitwear Corp., Greenfield, IN: July 10, 1999.

TA–W–37,738; Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., Green, OH: May 24, 1999.

TA–W–37,840; LaCrosse Footwear, Inc., Clintonville, WI: June 20, 1999.

TA–W–37,854; P.H. Glatfelter, Ecusta Div., Pisgah Forest, NC: June 20, 1999.

TA–W–37,846; Collins Pine Co., Collins Products, LLC, Klamath Falls, OR: June 23, 2000.

TA–W–37,654; Garan, Inc., Corinth, MS: April 19, 1999.

TA–W–37,869; Johnson Controls, Inc., Control Products Div., Goshen, IN: June 29, 1999.

TA–W–37,713; Vinson Timber Products, Inc., Trout Creek, MT: May 12, 1999.

TA–W–37,841; Braunstein, Inc., New York, NY: June 16, 1999.

TA–W–37,786; Andover Apparel Group, Inc., Formerly Andover Togs, Inc., Pisgah, AL: June 2, 1999.

TA–W–37,659; Climax Molybdenum Co., Henderson Operation, Empire, CO: April 28, 1999.

TA–W–37,759; Interstate Dyeing and Finishing, Passaic, NJ: May 19, 1999.

TA–W–37,652; Monofrax, Inc., Falconer, NY: April 13, 1999.

TA–W–37,719; Southland Manufacturing Co., Inc., including workers of Skilstaff, Inc., Ashland, AL: May 15, 1999.

TA–W–37,775; Ceng, Inc., Formerly Dexter Sportswear, Dexter, GA: June 12, 1999.

TA–W–37,850; Motorola, Inc., Energy Systems Group, Harvard, IL: June 10, 1999.

TA–W–37,452; E2A Technology, Inc., Conyers, GA: February 28, 1999.

TA–W–37,830; Grand Haven Brass Foundry, Grand Haven, MI: June 13, 1999.

TA–W–37,785; J.F. Sportswear, Inc., Scranton, PA: May 31, 1999.

TA–W–37,694; Meritor Automotive, Fairfield, IA: April 28, 1999.

TA–W–37,423 & A; Warren Corp., Stafford Springs, CT and Warren Leasing, New York, NY: February 28, 1999.

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 August, 2000.

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 in 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–03957; J.F. Sportswear, Scranton, PA

NAFTA–TAA–03988; P. H. Glatfelter, Ecusta Div., Pisgah Forest, NC

NAFTA–TAA–03860 & A, B, C, D, E; Pennzoil-Quaker State Co., Rouseville, PA, Oil City, PA, Reno, PA, Roosevelt, UT, Deerfield, OH and Rock Hill, SC

NAFTA–TAA–03919; Jenny K. Fashions, Meriden, CT

NAFTA–TAA–03947; KPT, Inc., Bloomfield, IN

NAFTA–TAA–03992; Precision Headed Products, Formerly Mascotech

Forming Technologies, Ypsilanti, MI

NAFTA–TAA–03821 & A, B; Quebcor World, Inc., Nashville, TN, Aurora, IL and St. Paul, MN

NAFTA–TAA–03892; Schreiber Foods, Inc., Monroe, WI

NAFTA–TAA–03931; Hoff Forest Products, Meridian, ID

NAFTA–TAA–03794; Meritor Automotive, Oshkosh, WI

NAFTA–TAA–03933; Sommers, Inc., Sommers Ribbon Co., Stroudsburg, PA

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

NAFTA–TAA–4014; CRH Catering Co., Inc., Connellsville, PA

NAFTA–TAA–04045 & A; ACS Shared Services, Inc., Berea, KY and Richmond, KY

NAFTA–TAA–0436; Eliance Corp., Web Center, Minot, ND

The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 250(a) of the Trade Act, as amended.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–04049; Aircraft and Electronics Specialties, Inc., d/b/a AES Interconnects, Inc., a/k/a HRIS Staff Management, Inc. San Benito, TX: July 28, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03910; Competitive Engineering, Inc., Tucson, AR: May 6, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03974; Hitachi Koki Imaging Solutions, Inc., (formerly Known as Data Products), Simi Valley, CA: June 2, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03986; Triquest Precision Plastics, Vancouver, WA: August 19, 2000.

NAFTA–TAA–03999; Johnson Controls, Inc., Control Products Div., Goshen, IN: June 29, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03994; Wildfire Pacific, Inc., Kent, WA: June 30, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04026; Austin Products, Inc., Holbrook, NY: July 10, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03953; Ceng, Inc., Formerly Dexter Sportswear, Dexter, GA: May 30, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03936; Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., Green, OH: May 24, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03989; Indiana Knitwear Corp., Greenfield, IN: June 26, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03973; Grand Haven Brass Foundry, Grand Haven, MI: June 15, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04011; Meritor Automotive, Fairfield, IA: May 5, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03920 & A; Louisiana Pacific Corp., Ketchikan Pulp Co., Ketchikan Sawmill, Ketchikan, AK and Timber Div., Prince of Wales Island, AK: May 12, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–03985; Frink America, Inc., Clayton, NY: June 12, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04018; Federal Mogul Wiper Products, Michigan City, IN: July 6, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04015; Optimum Air Corp., Malta, NY: June 25, 1999.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of August, 2000. 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: August 16, 2000.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–21727 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37,909]

Duke Energy Field Services, Ada, Oklahoma; Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on July 24, 2000, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Duke Energy Field Services, Ada, Oklahoma.

The company official submitting the petition has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 8th day of August 2000.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–21728 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37, 458, 458B, 458C]

House of Perfection, Inc.; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance on April 13, 2000, applicable to workers of House of Perfection, Inc., Williston Manufacturing Co., Williston, South Carolina. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 2000 (65 FR 30443).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The determination was amended on May 18, 2000 to include workers of the subject firms' Capitol City Manufacturing Co. located in West Columbia, South Carolina. Information shows that worker separations will occur at Manning Manufacturing Co. and Sumter Manufacturing Co. when they close in August and October 2000, respectively. The workers are engaged in employment related to the production of children's apparel such as shorts, tops, blouses and pants for their parent company, House of Perfection, Incorporated, West Columbia, South Carolina.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover the workers of Manning Manufacturing Co., Manning, South Carolina and Sumter Manufacturing Co., Sumter, South Carolina.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of House of Perfection, Incorporated who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–37,458 is hereby issued as follows:

''All workers of House of Perfection, Incorporated, Williston Manufacturing Co., Williston, South Carolina (TA–W–37,458), Manning Manufacturing Co., Manning, South Carolina (TA–W–37,458B) and Sumter Manufacturing Co., Sumter, South Carolina (TA–W–37,458C) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after March 3, 1999 through April 13, 2002 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.''