

(19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

**Background**

The Commission instituted this review on April 3, 2000 (65 FR 17531, April 3, 2000) and determined on July 6, 2000 that it would conduct an expedited review (65 FR 45105, July 20, 2000).

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on August 31, 2000. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3346 (August 2000), entitled Pure Magnesium from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-696 (Review).

Issued: September 5, 2000.  
By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-23337 Filed 9-11-00; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Office of the Secretary**

**Agency Recordkeeping/Reporting Requirements Under Emergency Review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)**

September 5, 2000.

The Department of Labor has submitted the following (see below) emergency processing public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub.L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). OMB approval has been requested by October 12, 2000. A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor Departmental Clearance Office, Ira Mills (202) 219-5095, x 113. Comments and questions about the ICR listed below should be forwarded to Office Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employment and Training Administration, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202) 395-7316. Written comments must be submitted to OIRA on or before October 10, 2000.

The Office of Management and Budget 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 submissions of response.

*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration.

*Title:* One-Stop Labor Market Information Grant Reporting.

*OMB Number:* 1205-ONEW.

*Affected Public:* States.

Form	No. of respondents	Responses per year	Total responses	Hours per response	Total burden hours
Annual Plan .....	54	2	54	36	1,944
Progress Reports .....	54	2	108	67	648
Total .....	54	3	162	43	2,592

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

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining):* \$0.

*Description:* ETA seeks approval of an annual plan narrative and two progress reports as requirements for One Stop Labor Market Information grants. This information will be used by the Department of Labor and its managing State partners to assure that an employment statistics system required by Wagner Peyser as amended by the Workforce Investment Act meets the needs of its customers. States seeking grants are requested to provide an annual grant narrative that provides specific information on how the grant funds will accomplish any of seven priorities developed by the Department through the Workforce Information Council. In addition the States are requested to provide a brief progress report twice during the grant period

which explains the progress of the grantee in accomplishing the plan.

**Ira Mills,**

*Departmental Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-23347 Filed 9-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-37,493 and NAFTA-3802]

**Levi Strauss & Company, RMQ Lab, Pellicano Finishing Plant, El Paso, Texas; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated August 1, 2000, filed by the petitioners, and August 21, 2000, filed by the company, administrative reconsideration is

requested regarding the Department's negative determination of eligibility for workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) under petition number TA-W-37,493 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) under petition number NAFTA-3802. The denial notices were signed on July 17, 2000, and published in the **Federal Register** on August 1, 2000 (65 FR 46954).

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 petitioners report that prior to the Pellicano plant closure, workers tested both domestic and foreign production. When the Pellicano plant closed, the workers at the Raw Material Quality Department (RMQ) lab in El Paso were left with only testing Mexican contractor's production and domestic and Mexican fabric. The petitioners state that there was no lab in Powell, Tennessee, until the El Paso lab shut down.

The company official's request for reconsideration emphasizes that Levi Strauss & Company closed six production plants in the El Paso area. Because of these closures, Levi Strauss & Company closed the El Paso Pellicano lab, and all employees were terminated in October 1999. The company states that imports contributed to the decision to close the six plants and the Pellicano lab. The company further states that an RMQ was created in Powell, Tennessee, using fewer workers than in the El Paso RMQ.

The workers at Levi Strauss & Company, RMQ lab, at the Pellicano Finishing Plants, El Paso, Texas, engaged in testing and quality control of denim products were denied eligibility to apply for TAA and NAFTA-TAA based on the findings that worker separations were attributable to the company's decision to have the RMQ lab work done at another domestic facility of Levi Strauss.

The petitioners and the company official both assert that some former El Paso lab employees are eligible for NAFTA-TAA. Our petition records do not show that a NAFTA-TAA certification has been issued for the RMQ workers.

### 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, D.C. this 30th day of August 2000.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00-23343 Filed 9-11-00; 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 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-37,744; *Sommers, Inc., Sommers Ribbon Co., Stroudsburg, PA*

TA-W-37,728; *Hill Knitting Mills, Richmond Hill, NY*

TA-W-37,600; *Trinity Industries, Inc., Mt. Orab, OH*

TA-W-37,828; *Johnstown Corp., Johnstown, PA*

TA-W-37,863; *Morton Forest Products, a/k/a Tree Source, Morton, WA*

TA-W-37,439; *National Ceramics, Inc., Ceramic Fashions, Inc., Cunningham, KY*

TA-W-37,780; *Memphis Chair Co., Gainesboro, TN*

TA-W-37,797; *Craft Houses*

*International, Inc., Kalkaska, MI*

TA-W-37,884; *Rycraft, Inc., Corvallis, OR*

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria

for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

TA-W-37,920; *Chic-A-Dee Packing Corp., Monmouth ME*

TA-W-37,921 & A; *ACS Shared Service, Inc., Berea, KY and Richmond, KY*

TA-W-37,812; *Amway Corp., Buy-Out Quality Assurance, Ada, MI*

TA-W-37,818; *ARCO Marine, Inc., Long Beach, CA*

TA-W-37,908; *Sweatt Industries, d/b/a Sentry Service, Odessa, TX*

TA-W-37,943; *Ryan International Airlines, Denver, CO*

TA-W-37,829; *Bucilla Corp., Hazleton, PA*

TA-W-37,951; *William Energy Service Co., Houston, TX*

TA-W-37,768; *Big B Valve Repair and Service, Inc., Laurel, MS*

TA-W-37,817; *DHL Worldwide Express, Houston, TX*

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

TA-W-37,824; *Avian Farms*

*International, Inc., Waterville, MI*

TA-W-37,879; *Beaulieu of America, Hollytex Div., Anadarko, OK*

TA-W-37,905; *Cooper Industries, Lighting Div., Elk Grove Village, IL*

TA-W-37,805; *Eastern Tool and Die, Inc., Newton, CT*

TA-W-37,914; *Joseph Timber Co LLC, Joseph, OR*

TA-W-37,901; *Oxo Welding Equipment Co., Troy, OH*

TA-W-37,676; *Schreiber Foods, Inc., Monroe, WI*

TA-W-37,857; *Optimum Air Corp., Malta, NY*

TA-W-37,877; *Swiss Maid, Inc., Greentown, PA*

TA-W-37,742B; *Key Industries, Inc., Quilting Div., Buffalo, NY*

TA-W-37,900 & A, B, C; *Oxy USA, Inc., Houston, TX, Aransas Pas, TX, Liberal, KS and Venice, LA*

TA-W-37,745 & A; *Louisiana Pacific Corp., Ketchikan Pulp Co., Ketchikan Sawmill, Ketchikan, AK and Timber Div., Prince of Wales Island, AK*

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

TA-W-37,890; *Thomson Consumer Electronics, Dunmore, PA*

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

TA-W-37,777; *Pearl Brewing Co., San Antonio, TX*

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) and criteria (3) have not been