

- 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: Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

Title: Prohibited Transaction Exemption 78-6, Class Exemption for Transactions Involving Collectively Bargained Multiple Employer Apprenticeship and Training Plans.

OMB Number: 1210-0080 (reinstatement without change).

Frequency: On occasion.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions.

Number of Responses: 5,000.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 5 minutes.

Total Burden Hours: 5,000.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total annual costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: This class exemption exempts from the prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) certain transactions between collectively bargained multiple employer apprenticeship plans and employers making contributions to these plans or employee organizations any of whose members are covered by the plans if certain conditions are met.

Agency: Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

Title: Prohibited Transaction Exemption 94-20, Class Exemption Relating to Certain Employee Benefit Plan Foreign Exchange Transactions.

OMB Number: 1210-0085 (reinstatement without change).

Frequency: On occasion.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions.

Number of Responses: 175.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 0 (marginal over and above records kept in the normal course of business by banks and their affiliates).

Total Burden Hours: 1.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total annual costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: This class exemption permits the purchase and sale of foreign currencies between an employee benefit plan and a bank or a broker-dealer or an affiliate thereof which is part in interest with respect to such plan.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration.

Title: Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC).

OMB Number: 1205-0371 (revision).

Agency Form Numbers: 9061, 9062, 9063, 9065.

Frequency: Quarterly.

Affected Public: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Responses: 52.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 20 minutes per form.

Total Burden Hours: 59,436.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total annual costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: The data and information provided the States on these forms are used for program planning and evaluation and for oversight or verification activities as mandated by the Revenue Act of 1978, Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1992, Section 51, Internal Revenue System Code, and Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996.

Theresa M. O'Malley,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-15141 Filed 6-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M; 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

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

June 4, 1997.

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 June 30, 1997. A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor Departmental Clearance Officer, Theresa M. O'Malley ((202) 219-5096 ext. 143).

Comments and questions about the ICR listed below should be forwarded to Office Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desl Officer for the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 ((202) 395-7316).

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, Office of Job Training Programs.

Title: Mid-Summer Report.

OMB Number: 1205-XXXX.

Frequency: One-time Report.

Affected Public: State and Local Job Training Partnership Act Agencies.

Number of Respondents: 56.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: Two hours.

Total Burden Hours: 112.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): N/A.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): \$750.

Description: The information collected would consist of information on both funding and enrollment levels. The information collected by the State would be rolled up into a summary report for each State. The information would be an update of the planned funding and enrollment data, except the planned figures would be reflected with preliminary actual data. There are only eleven data elements requested from each State. The report would be prepared as of July 15, 1997. The report would be forwarded to the Department of Labor.

This data is needed in order to provide information on the summer youth employment program in response to concerns likely to be raised by the U.S. Congress, the media and the Administration. It has been the Department's experience that there is a consistent and continuing need for this limited information. Traditionally, Congress wants to know the numbers of youth being served as they make final adjustments to the budgets which are under development. The media wants to provide the public with data to go along with personal interest stories. The Administration wants to know whether the programmatic objectives are being realized. If the data were not collected by the Department in a uniform manner, it is likely that attempts would be made by various parties on an ad hoc basis without any concern for standard points of reference.

Such collections could be misleading.

In addition to the above, such data can be invaluable in identifying problems which will permit making mid-course corrections if a pattern of under expenditure or under enrollment exists. Since the program only operates for six-eight weeks for most youth, it is critical that information be collected in an orderly manner which allows corrections and provides a picture of what is happening in each State.

Theresa M. O'Malley,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-15142 Filed 6-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-33,229]

Avesta Sheffield East, Incorporated Baltimore, Maryland; Notice of Revised Determination On Reconsideration

On April 2, 1997, the Department issued a Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to all workers of Avesta Sheffield, Incorporated, Baltimore, Maryland. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 15, 1997 (FR 62 18361).

Investigation findings show that the workers produced small and medium size stainless steel plates. The workers were denied TAA because the "contributed importantly" test of the Group Eligibility Requirements of the Trade Act was not met. This test is generally determined through a survey of the workers' firm's major declining customers.

By letter postmarked April 9, 1997, the United Steelworkers of America union representative requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's findings.

Findings on reconsideration show that the company closed in January 1997. The findings further revealed that major customers of the subject firm increased their purchases of imported small and medium size stainless steel plates in the relevant period.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the new facts obtained on reconsideration, it is concluded that the workers of Avesta Sheffield East, Incorporated of Baltimore, Maryland were adversely affected by increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with small and medium size stainless steel plates produced at the subject firm.

"All workers of Avesta Sheffield East, Incorporated of Baltimore, Maryland who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 13, 1996 through two years from the date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 27th day of May 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97-15130 Filed 6-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-31,385]

Johnson Controls Battery Group, Inc. Louisville, Kentucky; Notice of Negative Determination of Reconsideration On Remand

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) remanded for further investigation the Secretary of Labor's negative determination in *International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW Local 1288 and Employees and Former Employees of Johnson Controls Battery Group, Inc. v. Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor* (96-04-01141).

The Department's initial denial of the petition for employees of Johnson Controls Battery Group Inc., Louisville, Kentucky was issued on October 13, 1995 and published in the **Federal Register** on October 27, 1995 (60 FR 55063). The denial was based on the fact that criterion (3) of the Group Eligibility Requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The subject plant transferred production to another domestic location. Therefore, increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations.

On November 13, 1995, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's denial, which also resulted in affirmation of the initial negative decision. The determination was issued on February 6, 1996 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR 6658).

In response to the UAW's request for judicial review of the Labor Department's finding in this case, on February 4, 1997, the USCIT remanded

the case to the Department of Labor for further investigation.

On remand, the Department reviewed the previously certified adjustment assistance petitions for workers of Johnson Controls, Incorporated located in Bennington, Vermont (TA-W-29,403); Owosso, Michigan (TA-W-30,659); and Garland, Texas (TA-W-30,863). In each of these investigations customers of the respective subject firm were primarily aftermarket retailers. Each of these investigations resulted in a worker group certification because all of the Group Eligibility Requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were met. There were declines in company sales and or production, employment declined and it was determined that imports "contributed importantly" to worker separations. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. Customers of the Johnson Controls, Incorporated locations in Bennington, Vermont, Owosso, Michigan and Garland, Texas reported increased imports of aftermarket automotive batteries in the relevant time periods.

Findings on remand show that the customer base at the Louisville plant was different from the above cited Johnson Control locations. In Louisville, new car producers were the primary customers, purchasing original equipment automotive batteries.

Remand findings affirmed that the automotive battery production at the Louisville, Kentucky plant was not shifted to a foreign country, but to another domestic facility of Johnson Controls.

Investigation findings on remand show that although criteria (1) and (2) of the Group Eligibility Requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were met, criterion (3) was not met because the customers of the subject firm did not increase purchases of imported automotive batteries. Thus, increased imports of automotive batteries did not contribute to Johnson Control's decline in sales and production and employment at Louisville, Kentucky.

Conclusion

After reconsideration on remand, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Johnson Controls