

a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Thomas A. Mariani, Jr.,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 07-6028 Filed 12-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of a Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on December 5, 2007 a proposed Consent Decree in the case of *United States v. Liberty Property Limited Partnership*, Docket No. 07-cv-5119, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

In this proceeding, the United States filed a claim pursuant to sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607, for the performance of response work at a portion of the Crater Resources Superfund site, in Upper Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, and reimbursement of response costs. Pursuant to the consent decree the defendants will perform cleanup work on property owned by Liberty Property, within the Crater Resources Site. Liberty Property will also reimburse U.S. EPA for future response costs related to the work being performed.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdog.gov, or mailed to: P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to: *U.S. v. Liberty Property Limited Partnership*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-1283/2.

The Consent Decree may be examined at U.S. EPA Region III, Office of Regional Counsel, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029, c/o Patricia Miller. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined at the following Department of Justice Web site: http://www.usdog.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library,

P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611 or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood (tonia.fleetwood@usdog.gov), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$25.75 for the Consent Decree only (25 cents per page reproduction cost), or \$90.50 for the Consent Decree and all of the attached exhibits, payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Robert Brook,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 07-6027 Filed 12-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

Publication of Year 2007 Form M-1 With Electronic Filing Option, Notice

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Notice on the Availability of the Year 2007 Form M-1 with Electronic Filing Option.

SUMMARY: This document announces the availability of the Year 2007 Form M-1, Annual Report for Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Entities Claiming Exception. It is substantively identical to the 2006 Form M-1. The Form M-1 may again be filed electronically over the Internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For inquiries regarding the Form M-1 filing requirement, contact Amy Turner or Beth L. Baum, Office of Health Plan Standards and Compliance Assistance, at (202) 693-8335. For inquiries regarding how to obtain or file a Form M-1, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Form M-1 is required to be filed under section 101(g) and section 734 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended (ERISA), and 29 CFR 2520.101-2.

II. The Year 2007 Form M-1

This document announces the availability of the Year 2007 Form M-1, Annual Report for Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (MEWAs) and

Certain Entities Claiming Exception (ECEs). This year's Form M-1 is substantively identical to the Year 2006 Form M-1. The electronic filing option has been retained and filers are encouraged to use this method. The Year 2007 Form M-1 is due March 3, 2008, with an extension until May 2, 2008 available.

The Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) is committed to working together with administrators to help them comply with this filing requirement. Copies of the Form M-1 are available on the Internet at http://www.dol.gov/ebsa/forms_requests.html. In addition, after printing, copies will be available by calling the EBSA toll-free publication hotline at 1-866-444-EBSA (3272). Questions on completing the form are being directed to the EBSA help desk at (202) 693-8360. For questions regarding the electronic filing capability, contact the EBSA computer help desk at (202) 693-8600.

Statutory Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1021-1024, 1027, 1029-1031, 1059, 1132, 1134, 1135, 1181-1183, 1181 note, 1185, 1185a-b, 1191, 1191a-c; Secretary of Labor's Order No. 1-2003, 68 FR 5374 (February 2, 2003).

Signed at Washington, DC this 6th day of December, 2007.

Bradford P. Campbell,

Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-24040 Filed 12-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,090]

ABN AMRO Services Co., Inc., A Wholly Owned Subsidiary of Lasalle Bank Corporation, Chicago, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked October 18, 2007, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on September 17, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on October 3, 2007 (72 FR 56385).

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department for workers of ABN Amro Services Co., Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of LaSalle Bank Corporation, Chicago, Illinois was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm are engaged in information technology support. The investigation further revealed that no production of article(s) occurred within the firm or appropriate subdivision within the ABN Amro Services Co., Inc. and LaSalle Bank Corporation during the relevant time period.

The petitioner contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of the work performed by the workers of the subject firm. The petitioner acknowledges that the workers of the subject firm are "employees of the services sector supporting staff for the bank," but further alleges that the workers of the subject firm "produced output on regular basis". The petitioner describes these outputs as loans, wire transfer data, account reconciliation statements, billing statements, various statistical data, programs, reports, electronic files, etc.

The investigation revealed that all of the above "outputs" are information and documents used by the subject firm as incidentals to the purpose of the services provided by ABN Amro Services Co., Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of LaSalle Bank Corporation. The investigation revealed that workers of ABN Amro Services Co., Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of LaSalle Bank Corporation, Chicago, Illinois are engaged in IT applications support, maintenance and development. These services, as described above, are not considered production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act. No production took place at the subject facility and the workers did not support production of articles at any affiliated firm in the relevant time period.

The petitioner also alleges that the positions have been shifted from the subject firm to India and China.

The allegation of a shift to another country might be relevant if it was determined that workers of the subject

firm produced an article. However, the investigation determined that workers of ABN Amro Services Co., Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of LaSalle Bank Corporation, Chicago, Illinois do not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

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 in Washington, DC, this 5th day of December, 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-24023 Filed 12-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,330]

Gerdau Ameristeel, Perth Amboy, NJ; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on October 19, 2007 in response to a worker petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Gerdau Ameristeel, Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of December, 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-24020 Filed 12-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-61,976]

Intel Corporation, Mobile Wireless Networking Manufacturing/Operations Division, Hillsboro, OR; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated October 23, 2007, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the

Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on September 24, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on October 12, 2007 (72 FR 58131).

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 petition for the workers of Intel Corporation, Mobile Wireless Networking Manufacturing/Operations Division, Hillsboro, Oregon engaged in production of wireless cards for notebook computers was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The investigation revealed that worker separations at the subject firm are attributed to worldwide restructuring of the company to increase efficiencies. The investigation also revealed that production of wireless cards for notebook computers was shifted from the subject firm to Taiwan, which is not a party to a Free Trade Agreement with the United States or a beneficiary country. The subject firm did not import wireless cards for notebook computers and is not planning to import these products in the future.

The petitioner alleges that "activities were not restructured across the company", but were rather outsourced to suppliers in Asia. The petitioner also alleges that production from the subject firm was shifted to China, not Taiwan.

The initial investigation did reveal that production was shifted from Intel Corporation, Mobile Wireless Networking Manufacturing/Operations Division, Hillsboro, Oregon to Taiwan and further to China. Neither Taiwan nor China are countries that are a party to Free Trade Agreements with the United States or beneficiary countries. Thus a shift in production to either China or Taiwan does not qualify workers of the subject firm eligible for TAA.

The subject firm reported no imports of wireless cards for notebook