interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 29, 2001, Interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on July 30, 2001 (66 FR 39336).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 01–24793 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Salutation Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on August 24, 2001, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Salutation Consortium, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Tobias Maslak, Frauenau, Bavaria, Germany; Pietro Magnanini, Lucrezia, Italy; and Daniela Elena Popescu, Oradea, Bihor, Romania have been added as parties to this venture. Also Fujitsu Limited, Inagi-shi, Tokyo, Japan; Mburst, Inc. (formerly known as MicroBurst, Inc.), Rockville, MD; Toshiba Tec Corporation, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan; and USA Technologies, Inc., Wayne, PA have been dropped as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Salutation Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 30, 1995, Salutation Consortium, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 27, 1995 (60 FR 33233).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 23, 2001. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on July 5, 2001 (66 FR 35459).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 01–24794 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

September 27, 2001.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection requests (ICRs) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor. To obtain documentation contact Darrin King at (202) 693–4129 or E-Mail: *King-Darrin@dol.gov.*

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: Stuart Shapiro, OMB Desk Officer for OSHA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 ((202) 395–7316), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- 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 agency's 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.

Agency: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Title: Notice of Alleged Safety and Health Hazards, OSHA–7 Form.

OMB Number: 1218–0064.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Type of Response: Reporting.

Frequency: On occasion.

Number of Respondents: 55,132.

Number of Annual Responses: 55,132.

Estimated Time Per Response: Varies from 15–25 minutes.

Total Burden Hours: 14,767.

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs: $0.

Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): $882.

Description: The Occupational Safety and Health Act, Section 8(f)(1) and 29 CFR 1903.11(a) and (c) authorizes employees or representative of employees to report an alleged violation of a safety and health standard to OSHA. The OSHA–7 Form is one mechanism for reporting alleged violations. The Form also provides an employer with notice of the complaint. The information is used by OSHA to evaluate the alleged hazards to determine if reasonable grounds exist to conduct an inspection of the workplace.

Ira L. Mills,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–24829 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,839 and NAFTA–4547]

ASARCO, Inc., East Helena Plant, East Helena, MT; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of May 31, 2001, the company 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–38,839, and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA) under petition NAFTA–4547. The denial notices applicable to workers of ASARCO Inc., East Helena Plant, East Helena, Montana, were signed on April 17, 2001, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 3, 2001 (66 FR 22262).

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 ASARCO Inc., East Helena Plant, East Helena, Montana, producing lead bullion (primary product produced at the plant), was denied because the ''contributed 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 plant customers are located outside the United States and therefore the company can not be impacted by customers purchasing imported lead bullion. The subject firm did not import lead bullion 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. A survey was not conducted due to the conditions depicted in the previous paragraph. The subject firm did not import lead bullion, nor was production of lead bullion shifted form the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioner alleges that other ASARCO Incorporated locations have been certified for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance. The certifications were based on different principle products, with a different customer base than the subject plants' customer base. The work performed at the subject plant is not vertically integrated into any of those products during the relevant period and therefore can not be associated with any of those certifications. Although the subject plant produced lead bullion for a certified facility, producing refined lead, ASARCO's Omaha, Nebraska (TA–W–35,300 and NAFTA–02752) those certifications expired on May 31, 1998. Therefore, the subject plant can not be considered vertically integrated, due to the time frame of that certification not being within under the relevant time frame.

The petitioner also alleges that the plant was impacted by depressed lead prices and events in international markets. Price and events in international markets are not factors which pertain to the ''contributed importantly'' criteria.

The Department, when determining import impact for a worker group, does consider import statistics for products similar to what the subject plant produces. U.S. import statistics for refined lead are available, however these statistics are not equivalent to the product (lead bullion—an intermediate product) the subject plant produced. Therefore, those statistics are not reflective of the plant's product. While U.S. import data are helpful in identifying trends in imports of specific products, in most cases, the Department relies on a survey of the major declining customers of the subject firm.

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, D.C., this 18th day of September, 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24822 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–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 September, 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 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–39,185; Cemex Kosmos Cement Co., Pittsburgh Plant, Pittsburgh, PA

TA–W–39,015; Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel Corp., Wheeling, WV And Operating at the Following Locations A; Beech Bottom, WV, B; Allenport, PA, C; Steubenville, OH, D; Martins Ferry, OH, E; Yorkville, OH

TA–W–39,769; Paxar Corp., Paxar Label Group Woven Division, Canton, NC

TA–W–39,499; Tescom Corp., High Purity Controls Division, Elk River, MN

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–39,444; Berenfield Containers, Ltd, Masury, OH

TA–W–38,851; Norgen, Inc., Mt Clemens, MI

TA–W–39,651; Cranston Print Works, Webster, MA

TA–W–39,889; Wisne Automation and Engineering Co., Novi, MI

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

TA–W–39,946; Valley Machining Co., Rock Valley, IA

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

TA–W–39,653; Covington Industries, Inc., New York, NY

TA–W–39,776; River Parishes Oil Co., Inc., Norco, LA

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company