

Department of Labor issued a Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on August 9, 1996, applicable to all workers of Orbit Industries, Incorporated located in Helen, Georgia. The notice was published in the Federal Register on September 13, 1996 (61 FR 48504).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Based on new information received by the company, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers at the affiliate plant of the subject firm, Penline Garment Company, Toccoa, Georgia. The production facility closed September 27, 1996. The workers at Penline Garment were engaged in employment related to the production of apparel.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of the subject firm who were adversely affected by increased imports of apparel.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-32,532 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Orbit Industries, Incorporated, Helen, Georgia (TA-W-32,532) and Penline Garment Company, Toccoa, Georgia (TA-W-32,532D) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 24, 1995 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of September 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 96-26491 Filed 10-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-32,388]

**Snap-On, Incorporated; Mt. Carmel, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By an application dated August 26, 1996, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM&AW) requested administrative reconsideration of the subject petition for trade adjustment assistance (TAA). The denial notice was signed on July 29, 1996 and published in the Federal Register on August 26, 1996 (61 FR 43791).

The initial investigation findings showed that the workers produced hand tools such as ratchets, pliers and miscellaneous wrenches. The Department's denial was based on the fact that the "contributed importantly"

test of the Group Eligibility Requirements of the Trade Act was not met. Company officials indicated that a significant portion of the layoffs were attributable to the shift of a torque wrench production line in early 1996, from the Mt. Carmel plant to an affiliated facility located in Industry, California. The corporate decision to shift production to another domestic location would not form the basis for a worker certification.

The IAM&AW request for reconsideration enclosed numerous statements from workers of the subject firm describing an all employee meeting where a company official stated that imports of some hand tools from abroad were increasing in quality and decreasing in price, and thus, impacting workers jobs in Mt. Carmel.

Another test of the "contributed importantly" criterion is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. However, in this case the hand tools produced by Snap-On are mass marketed through a dealer network and sold to independent automobile mechanics. Therefore, a customer survey was not feasible. The Department must rely on import statistics to determine import impact on workers of the subject firm.

Based on petitioners allegations, the Department reviewed and updated the trade statistics for wrenches and pliers. Aggregate U.S. imports of wrenches declined from 1994 to 1995 and in the twelve-month period of June through May 1995-1996 compared to the same twelve months of 1994-1995. Aggregate U.S. imports of pliers rose slightly from 1994 to 1995 but decreased in the twelve-month period of June through May 1995-1996 compared to the same twelve months of 1994-1995.

**Conclusion**

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act to workers and former workers of Snap-On, Incorporated, Mt. Carmel, Illinois.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of October 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 96-26489 Filed 10-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

**Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Unemployment Insurance Benefit Accuracy Measurement Program**

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. With this notice, the Employment and Training Administration is soliciting comments concerning a proposed pilot test of collecting information on the accuracy of denials of Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefit eligibility. A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the employee named below in the contact section of this notice.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before December 16, 1996.

Written comments should:

- 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.

**ADDRESSES:** Burman H. Skrable, Unemployment Insurance Service, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of

Labor, Room S-4522, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210, 202-219-5922 (this is not a toll-free number); FAX, 202-219-8506; Internet: eta.sao.skrableb@doleta.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Since 1987, all State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs) except the Virgin Islands have been required by regulation at 20 CFR 602 to operate a Benefits Quality Control (BQC) program to assess the accuracy of their UI benefit payments. The Department's authority is found at Sections 303(a)(1), 303(a)(6) and 303(b)(1) of the Social Security Act. The methodology of this program, renamed Benefit Accuracy Measurement (BAM) in 1996, requires each State draw to a weekly sample of UI payments. Annual samples presently average slightly over 800 cases per State, with a range of 480 to 1800. A specially trained staff of investigators reviews agency records and contacts the claimant, employers and third parties to verify all the information pertinent to the benefit amount for the sampled week. Using the verified information, the investigators determine whether the benefit payment were proper or improper in accordance with State law and policy. Any differences between the amount BAM determines proper and the actual payment is an underpayment or overpayment error and is coded into an automated database, which resides on each State's computer. Data on error types, causes and responsibilities are also entered into the database. This information is used by the State and DOL to estimate the extent of mispayments, monitor program quality, guide possible future program improvements, inform system stakeholders and perform various policy analyses. The program is operated under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval number 1205-0245; approval expires September 30, 1999.

To date, the nationwide BAM program has only assessed the accuracy of decisions to pay UI benefits. In 1986-87, five States measured the accuracy of decisions denying UI benefits eligibility using the BQC methodology in a one-year pilot test.

The test covered monetary denials and nonmonetary denials at the separation and nonseparation decision levels. Although most pilot States showed relatively high rates of error in their denial determinations, resource considerations and other priorities precluded the Department from expanding the pilot effort or expanding the BQC program to include denials.

Since that time, however, the Department has been urged by several groups to measure denied UI benefit claims' accuracy in the States. The groups have included organized labor, employee rights legal support groups, the Department's Office of Inspector General, and, most recently, the Vice President's National Performance Review.

In fall 1995, after a two-year effort, a joint workgroup of senior SESA managers and Federal staff recommended several changes in the way UI operational performance was measured and improved. The Department has accepted most of the recommendations and is now implementing them under the rubric of UI Performs. One of these is to add the measurement of denied claim accuracy to the BAM program. Because of the time elapsed and changes in State environments since the first pilot, the Department deems it prudent to conduct a new pilot to guide implementation of this measure.

##### II. Current Actions

This is a request for OMB approval [under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A))] to conduct a pilot test of applying the BAM sample verification methodology to ascertain the accuracy of SESA decisions that deny UI benefits. This will be an operational pilot test of measuring denied claim accuracy, intended to identify costs and operational difficulties and develop workable procedures and software for a nationwide program.

The salient characteristics of the pilot are as follows:

- Five States, selected from volunteers, representing a range of geography, size and eligibility provisions of State law and policy. The States are Nebraska, New Jersey, South Carolina, West Virginia and Wisconsin.
- Separate samples of approximately 200 each will be selected from State universes of monetary denials, and nonmonetary denials for separation and nonseparation reasons. Between the claimant, State staff, employers and third parties, it is expected that respondents per sampled case will average 3.3, or 1,980 per State in the one-year pilot.
- All samples will be investigated using the BAM procedures in which records are reviewed and interested parties are contacted to verify or obtain additional information pertinent to the decision.
- In addition, the two kinds of nonmonetary denials will be independently assessed using the

Quality Performance Index instrument to see whether this records-only review is a workable alternative to BAM's more costly den-novo factfinding.

*Type of Review:* New.

*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration.

*Title:* Unemployment Insurance Benefit Accuracy Measurement Program Pilot Test.

*Timing:* May 1997-May 1998.

*Recordkeeping:* States are required to follow their State laws regarding public record retention in retaining BAM records.

*Affected Public:* Individuals; business; other for-profit/not-for-profit institutions; farms; Federal, State, Local, or Tribal Governments.

*Total Responses:* 9,900 (5 States/1,980 per State).

*Frequency:* Weekly.

*Total Responses:* 9,900 (5 States/1,980 per State).

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 1.65 hours.

*Total Burden Hours:* 16,320 hours.

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* \$457,500.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining):* \$413,315.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 10, 1996.

Mary Ann Wyrtsch,

Director, Unemployment Insurance Service.

[FR Doc. 96-26493 Filed 10-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

#### **Job Training Partnership Act: Indian and Native American Employment and Training Programs; List of Allocations by Grantee for Title II-B and Title IV-A Funds Received Under the Job Training Partnership Act for 1996**

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

**ACTION:** A list of current JTPA section 401 grantees receiving JTPA title II-B funds, and the amounts funded under title II-B for Calendar Year (CY) 1996, can be found in Appendix No. 1. The same list of grantees and the amounts funded under title IV-A of JTPA for Program Year (PY) 1996 can be found in Appendix No. 2.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the requirements at section 162(d) of the amended Act, the Department hereby publishes the final allocation figures for JTPA section 401 Indian and Native American grantees for 1996, by title.