

APPENDIX—Continued

[26 TAA petitions instituted between 9/26/11 and 9/30/11]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
80469	CEVA Logistics—Project HCL (State/One-Stop)	Houston, TX	09/27/11	09/13/11
80470	Precision Valve, SC—Plant 2 (State/One-Stop)	Greenville, SC	09/27/11	09/26/11
80471	Precision Valve, SC—Plant 1 (State/One-Stop)	Travelers Rest, SC	09/27/11	09/26/11
80472	Tiger Drylac USA Inc. (Company)	Reading, PA	09/27/11	09/26/11
80473	Reading Powder Coatings Inc. (Company)	Reading, PA	09/27/11	09/26/11
80474	Simonton Windows (State/One-Stop)	McAlester, OK	09/27/11	09/26/11
80475	Fairlane Division VRTX, Inc. (Company)	New York, NY	09/27/11	09/26/11
80476	Wells Fargo Bank N/A (Workers)	Bethlehem, PA	09/28/11	09/27/11
80477	Allstate Insurance Co. (State/One-Stop)	Northbrook, IL	09/28/11	09/27/11
80478	Skip's Cutting, Inc. (Workers)	Ephrata, PA	09/28/11	09/27/11
80479	Excelsior Services Group (Company)	Dallas, TX	09/29/11	09/28/11
80480	Elsevier, Inc (Company)	San Diego, CA	09/30/11	09/28/11
80481	Kyowa America Corporation (State/One-Stop)	Westminster, CA	09/30/11	09/29/11
80482	Weather Shield Mfg Inc. (Workers)	Park Falls, WI	09/30/11	09/10/11
80483	American Apparel (State/One-Stop)	Garden Grove, CA	09/30/11	09/29/11
80484	Cummins Filtration (Company)	Lake Mills, IA	09/30/11	09/27/11
80485	R. R. Donnelley—Bloomsburg (Union)	Bloomsburg, PA	09/30/11	09/27/11

[FR Doc. 2011-27166 Filed 10-19-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-80,350]

**Baby Bliss, Inc., Middleville, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application received September 26, 2011, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers Baby Bliss, Inc., Middleville, Michigan (Baby Bliss). The determination was issued on September 2, 2011. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 19, 2011 (76 FR 58046). The workers of Baby Bliss were engaged in activities related to the production of children's clothing.

The petition (dated August 8, 2011) stated that "Pleasant Company has been a customer of ours since 1985. New owners (Mattel) took over that company and proceeded to all of the apparel and other production to a foreign country (China)."

The negative determination was based on the Department's findings that Baby Bliss did not employ a certifiable worker group during the period under investigation within the meaning of Section 222(a) or Section 222(b) of the Act.

Criterion (1) has not been met because Baby Bliss did not employ a worker group during the relevant time period. A worker group means that the firm must have at least three full-time workers during the year preceding the TAA petition date. Baby Bliss did not meet this threshold level. Further, the criteria set forth in 29 CFR 90.16(e) was not met.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that he was "the only officer/employee who possessed the information to file this petition" and asserted that he did not file a petition earlier because he was out of the country from November 2004 through February 2008, then incarcerated from February 2008 through March 2011.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c), administrative 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.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, previously submitted materials, the applicable statute, and relevant regulation, the Department determines that there is no new information, mistake in fact, or misinterpretation of the facts or of the law.

**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, DC, this 4th day of October, 2011.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2011-27164 Filed 10-19-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-80,219]

**Beacon Medical Services, LLC, Aurora, CO; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application received July 25, 2011, a worker requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Beacon Medical Services, LLC, Aurora, Colorado (Beacon Medical Services). The negative determination was issued on June 22, 2011. The Department's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on July 8, 2011 (76 FR 40401). The workers of Beacon Medical Services are engaged in activities related

to the supply of third party medical billing and coding services.

The petition filed on behalf of “medical coders” at Beacon Medical Services, LLC, Aurora, Colorado, states that “our jobs were outsourced to India.”

The negative determination was based on the Department’s findings that Beacon Medical Services does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(a) or Section 222(b) of the Act. In order to be considered eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, the worker group seeking certification (or on whose behalf certification is being sought) must work for a “firm” or appropriate subdivision that produces an article.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c), administrative 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.

After the Trade Act of 2009 expired in February 2011, petitions for TAA were instituted under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 (Trade Act of 2002). Therefore, the statute applicable to TA–W–80,219 is the Trade Act of 2002. The applicable regulation is codified in 29 CFR Part 90, Subpart B.

Section 222 of the Trade Act of 2002 establishes the worker group eligibility requirements. The requirements include either “imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased” or “a shift in production by such workers’ firm or subdivision to a foreign country of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by such firm or subdivision.”

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner asserts that Beacon Medical Services “sent our jobs OVESEAS TO INDIA.”

A shift in the supply of services (or like or directly competitive services) by Beacon Medical Services to a foreign country is not a basis for certification under the criteria set forth by the Trade Act of 2002.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, previously submitted

materials, the applicable statute, and relevant regulation, the Department determines that there is no new information, mistake in fact, or misinterpretation of the facts or of the law.

#### 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, DC, this 4th day of October, 2011.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2011–27162 Filed 10–19–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2011–0186]

#### Inorganic Arsenic Standard; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

**AGENCY:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

**ACTION:** Request for public comments.

**SUMMARY:** OSHA solicits public comments concerning its proposal to extend the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) approval of the information collection requirements specified in the Inorganic Arsenic Standard (29 CFR part 1910.1018).

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted (postmarked, sent, or received) by December 19, 2011.

#### ADDRESSES:

*Electronically:* You may submit comments and attachments electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for submitting comments.

*Facsimile:* If your comments, including attachments, are not longer than 10 pages, you may fax them to the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–1648.

*Mail, hand delivery, express mail, messenger, or courier service:* When using this method, you must submit your comments and attachments to the OSHA Docket Office, Docket No. OSHA–2011–0186, U.S. Department of

Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Deliveries (hand, express mail, messenger, and courier service) are accepted during the Department of Labor’s and Docket Office’s normal business hours, 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m., e.t.

*Instructions:* All submissions must include the Agency name and OSHA docket number (OSHA–2011–0186) for the Information Collection Request (ICR). All comments, including any personal information you provide, are placed in the public docket without change, and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>. For further information on submitting comments see the “Public Participation” heading in the section of this notice titled **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

*Docket:* To read or download comments or other material in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> or the OSHA Docket Office at the address above. All documents in the docket (including this **Federal Register** notice) are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index; however, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through the Web site. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection and copying at the OSHA Docket Office. You also may contact Theda Kenney at the address below to obtain a copy of the ICR.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Theda Kenney, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3609, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693–2222.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (i.e., employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA’s estimate of the information collection burden is accurate. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the OSH Act) (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*) authorizes information collection