(WHD) has created Forms WH–514, WH–514a, and WH–515, which allow FLC applicants to verify to the WHD that the vehicles used to transport migrant/seasonal agricultural workers meet the MSPA vehicle safety standards and that anyone who drives such workers meets the Act's minimum physical requirements. The WHD uses the information in deciding whether to authorize the FLC/FLCE applicant to transport/drive any migrant/seasonal agricultural worker(s) or to cause such transportation. Form WH–514 is used to verify that any vehicle used or caused to be used to transport any migrant/seasonal agricultural worker(s) meets the Department of Transportation (DOT) safety standards. When the adopted DOT rules do not apply, FLC applicants seeking authorization to transport any migrant/seasonal agricultural workers use Form WH–514a to verify that the vehicles meet the DOL safety standards and, upon the vehicle meeting the required safety standards, the form is completed. Form WH–515 is a doctor's certificate used to document that a motor vehicle driver or operator meets the minimum DOT physical requirements that the DOL has adopted. This information collection is currently approved for use through August 31, 2015. As part of this renewal, the Department proposes to make revisions to the Forms WH–514, WH–514a, WH–515, and WH–530.

II. *Review Focus:* The DOL is particularly interested in comments that:

* 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 submissions of responses.

III. *Current Actions:* The DOL seeks to extend the information collection requests for the Application for a Farm Labor Contractor or Farm Labor Contractor Employee Certificate of Registration; Motor Vehicle Safety for Transportation of Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers and the Doctor's Certification (minimum physical requirements to drive a vehicle). Additionally, DOL seeks the approval of the revisions of the subject information collection requirements in the Farm Labor Contractor/Farm Labor Contractor Employee Application (WH–530), revisions to the Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Reports for Transportation Subject to Department of Labor Safety Requirements (WH–514a form), revisions to the Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Report for Transportation Subject to Department of Transportation Requirements (WH–514 form), and revisions to the Doctor's Certificate, (WH–515 form).

Type of Review: Revision and Extension.

Agency: Wage and Hour Division.

Titles: Application for a Farm Labor Contractor or a Farm Labor Contractor Employee Certificate of Registration; Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Report for Transportation Subject to Department of Transportation Requirements; Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Report for Transportation Subject to Department of Labor Safety Standards; MSPA Doctor's Certificate.

OMB Control Number: 1235–0016.

Agency Numbers: Forms WH–514, WH–514a, WH–515, WH–530.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits, Farms.

Respondents: 23,196.

Total Annual responses: 23,196.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 9,334.

Estimated Time per Response: 5 minutes for the vehicle mechanical inspection reports (WH–514 or WH–514a) and 20 minutes for the MSPA Doctor's Certification (WH–515) and 30 minutes for the Farm Labor Contractor Application (WH–530).

Frequency: On Occasion, but no more often than annual.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): $0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): $447,354.

Dated: March 18, 2015.

Mary Ziegler,

Director, Division of Regulations, Legislation and Interpretation.

[FR Doc. 2015–06758 Filed 3–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–85,640]

Covidien LP, North American Shared Services Group, Mansfield, Massachusetts; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated December 11, 2014, a separated worker requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance, applicable to workers and former workers of Covidien LP, North American Shared Services Group, Mansfield, Massachusetts (Subject Firm). The denial notice was signed on November 25, 2014, and the Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on December 10, 2014 (79 FR 73338).

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 initial investigation revealed that the subject firm does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(a) or Section 222(b) of the Act. Rather, the investigation revealed that the workers' firm supplied services related to administrative support and customer services. In order to be considered eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, the worker group seeking certification (or on whose behalf certification is being sought) must work for a ''firm'' or appropriate subdivision that produces an article. The definition of a firm includes an individual proprietorship, partnership, joint venture, association, corporation (including a development corporation), business trust, cooperative, trustee in bankruptcy, and receiver under decree of any court.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA because the subject firm shifted to a foreign country the supply of like or

directly competitive services with those provided by the workers of the subject firm.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination. Based on these findings, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After careful 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 in Washington, DC, this 12th day of March, 2015.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2015–06833 Filed 3–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–82,478]

Brayton International, a Subsidiary of Steelcase, Inc., Including On-Site Leased Workers From Manpower Group, Experis, Bradley Personnel Inc., Graham Personnel Services, Aerotek, Workforce Unlimited, Experis, and Impact Business Group High Point, North Carolina; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (''Act''), 19 U.S.C. 2273, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 11, 2013, applicable to workers of Brayton International, a subsidiary of Steelcase, Inc., including on-site leased workers from The Manpower Group/Experis, High Point, North Carolina. The Department's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on March 8, 2013 (Volume 78 FR 15051).

At the request of a company official, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in activities related to the production of office furniture.

The company reports that workers leased from Bradley Personnel Inc., Graham Personnel Services, Aerotek, Workforce Unlimited, Experis, and imPact Business Group were employed on-site at the High Point, North Carolina location of Brayton International. The Department has determined that these workers were sufficiently under the control of the subject firm to be considered leased workers.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include leased workers from Bradley Personnel Inc., Graham Personnel Services, Aerotek, Workforce Unlimited, Experis, and imPact Business Group working on-site at the High Point, North Carolina location of Brayton International.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–82,478 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Brayton International, a subsidiary of Steelcase, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Manpower Group, Experis, Bradley Personnel Inc., Graham Personnel Services, Aerotek, Workforce Unlimited, Experis, and imPact Business Group, High Point, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 15, 2012 through March 11, 2015, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on the date of certification through March 11, 2015, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 10th day of March, 2015.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2015–06838 Filed 3–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–85,556]

Honeywell, Aerospace Division; Including On-Site Leased Workers From OptiScan, Tempe, Arizona; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated January 28, 2015, a worker requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance applicable to workers and former workers of Honeywell, Aerospace Division, including on-site leased workers from OptiScan, Tempe, Arizona (Honeywell). The determination was issued on December 9, 2014 and the Department of Labor's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on December 30, 2014 (79 FR 78496).

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the findings that with respect to Section 222(a) and Section 222(b) of the Act, Criterion (1) had not been met because a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm had not become totally or partially separated, nor were they threatened to become totally or partially separated.

The request for reconsideration asserts that the subject worker group was defined too broadly and therefore failed to capture the worker separations and trade impact experienced by the specific workers of OptiScan who were employed on-site at Honeywell, Aerospace Division, Tempe, Arizona; that numerous firms which supplied the subject firm with on-site leased workers were erroneously combined together for the purpose of reaching a determination as a single firm, yet they were not all in support of the manufacturing process at the subject firm; that the employment decline criterion was met for the OptiScan workers employed on-site at Honeywell, Aerospace Division, Tempe, Arizona; and that the data management services they supplied in support of the engineering group were shifted to a foreign country.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and has determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify