Battery Group Inc., Louisville, Kentucky.

Signed at Washington, DC this 16th day of May 1997.

#### Curtis K. Kooser,

Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance. [FR Doc. 97–15137 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

# Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-32,617 and TA-W-32,617A]

### Jolie Handbag, Incorporated Hialeah, Florida and Jolie Handbag, Incorporated Laredo, Texas; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on October 3, 1996 applicable to all workers of Jolie Handbag, Incorporated in Hialeah, Florida. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1996 (61 FR 55821).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that worker separations occurred at Jolie Handbag's Laredo, Texas facility when it closed during April, 1997. The workers were engaged in employment related to the production of ladies' handbags.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers at the subject firms' Laredo, Texas location.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Jolie Handbag adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–31,617 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Jolie Handbag, Hialeah, Florida (TA–W–32,617), and Laredo, Texas (TA–W–32,617A) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 11, 1995, are eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974." Signed at Washington, DC this 22nd day of May, 1997.

## Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–15138 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-33,472]

#### Master Lock Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on May 12, 1997 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Master Lock Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of May, 1997.

#### Russell T. Kile

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance. [FR Doc. 97–15139 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Employment and Training Administration

#### [TA-W-33,525]

#### Xerox Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on May 27, 1997, in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Xerox Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

A negative determination applicable to the petitioning group of workers was issued on February 14, 1997 (TA–W– 33,141). No new information is evident which would result in a reversal of the Department's previous determination. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated. Signed in Washington, D.C. this 27th day of May, 1997.

## Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–15136 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

## ETA Data Validation Handbook No. 361; Comment Request

#### **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. Currently, the **Employment and Training** Administration is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the ETA Data Validation Handbook No. 361. A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the addresses section of this notice. DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses section below on or before August 11, 1997

The Department of Labor 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 responses.

ADDRESSES: Wayne S. Gordon, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave. NW, Room S–4231, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 219–5915 (this is not a toll-free number) and, where applicable wgordon@doleta.gov, or fax (202) 219– 8506.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### I. Background

Under legal authority granted by Social Security Act, Title III, Section 303(a)(6), the State-Federal Unemployment Insurance Service (UIS) relies on the accurate counting and reporting of Federally defined workloads by State Employment Security agencies (SESAs) as:

• An input to determining the amount of dollars each State receives from DOL to fund the administrative costs of the UI system;

• An essential element in determining levels of unemployment

which trigger on or off special unemployment compensation programs;

 Input to econometric models and research projects; and

• Data to evaluate State performance under the UI program.

The UIS funds the administrative costs of individual SESAs based on workload counts and on the time required to perform work related functions. The budgeted workload items are:

Initial Claims

Additional Claims

Continued Claims

Nonmonetary Determinations Appeals

Subject Employers

Wage Records

States are required to report these items together with other data items on a monthly or quarterly basis on OMB approved forms. States have the responsibility for developing their own system of collecting data and compiling report items. As a result, there are almost as many different systems for developing data as there are States.

Prior to the inception of the UI Workload Validation process, investigation showed that workload definitions were being interpreted differently by the various SESAs. In order to correct these discrepancies, an effort was initiated to review and clarify workload item definitions on.

### **II. Current Actions**

SESAs have made definite improvements since the beginning of the program. However, some States which did improve early developed problems again in later years. Identifying and correcting problems one year does not guarantee the problem is solved forever. Changes in staff, lack of continued training, and other variables, such as automating the reporting of items that were previously reported manually, effect the proper reporting over time. It is important to revalidate at intervals to assure problems have not resurfaced or that new problems have not developed.

Type of Review: Extension.

*Agency:* United States Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

*Title:* Data Validation Handbook No. 361.

### *OMB Number:* 1205–0055. *Agency Number:* 1205. *Affected Public:* State Government.

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response	Burden (hours)
Data Validation Questionnaire	53	Annually	53	2	106
Worksheet No. 1	53	Annually	53	4	212
Worksheet No. 2	53	Annually	583	1.5	874.5
Worksheets A & B	<10	Annually	0	0	0
Worksheet No. 3	53	Annually	1060	.4	424
Worksheet No. 4	53	Annually	1060	.6	636
Worksheet No. 5	53	Annually	1060	.4	424
Worksheet No. 6	<10	Annually	0	0	0
Worksheet No. 7	53	Annually	1060	2	2120
Worksheet No. 8	53	Annually	530	2.4	1272
Worksheet No. 9	53	Annually	530	.8	424
Worksheet No. 10	53	Annually	53	4	212
Prepare Plan	53	Annually	53	1.5	79.5
Prepare Summary Report	53	Annually	53	4	212
Totals			6148		6996

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

Dated: June 4, 1997.

## Grace A. Kilbane,

Director, Unemployment Insurance Service. [FR Doc. 97–15140 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-01228]

#### Boise Cascade Corporation Paper Division Vancouver, Washington; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On February 4, 1997, the Department, issued a Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration regarding the petition for workers of the subject firm. The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on December 6, 1996, because Boise Cascade did not import coated and security paper from sources located in Canada or Mexico, nor was there a shift of production to Canada of Mexico. Furthermore, a survey of the subject firm's customers revealed that none of the customers reported purchasing paper from Canada or Mexico during the relevant periods. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 24, 1996 (61 FR 67858).

On reconsideration, the Department found that the customer survey