

II. Background on the Wyoming AMLR Plan

The Secretary of the Interior approved Wyoming's AMLR plan on February 14, 1983. You can find background information on the Wyoming AML program, including the Secretary's findings and our responses to comments, in the February 14, 1983, **Federal Register** (48 FR 6536). Wyoming changed its plan a number of times since the Secretary first approved it. In 1984, we accepted the State's certification that it addressed all known coal-related impacts in Wyoming that were eligible for funding under its program. As a result, the State may now reclaim low priority non-coal reclamation projects. You can read about the certification and OSM's acceptance in the May 25, 1984, **Federal Register** (49 FR 22139). At the same time, we also accepted Wyoming's proposal that it will ask us for funds to reclaim any additional coal-related problems that occur during the life of the Wyoming AML program as soon as it becomes aware of them. In the April 13, 1992, **Federal Register** (57 FR 12731), we announced our decision to accept other changes in Wyoming's plan that describe how it will rank eligible coal, non-coal, and facility projects for funding. Those changes also authorized the Governor of Wyoming to elevate the priority of a project based upon the Governor's determination of need and urgency. They also expanded the State's ability to construct public facilities under section 411 of SMCRA. We approved additional changes in Wyoming's plan concerning noncoal lien authority and contractor eligibility that improve the efficiency of the State's AML program. That approval is described in the February 21, 1996, **Federal Register** (61 FR 6537).

Once a State certifies that it has addressed all remaining abandoned coal mine problems, and the Secretary concurs, then it may request funds to undertake abandoned noncoal mine reclamation, community impact assistance, and public facilities projects under sections 411 (b), (e), and (f) of SMCRA.

State law and regulations that apply to the proposed Greybull Sewer Improvement project funding request include Wyoming Statute 35-11-1202 and Wyoming Abandoned Mine Land Regulations, Chapter VII, of the Wyoming Abandoned Mine Program.

III. Wyoming's Request To Fund Part of the Cost of the Greybull Sewer Improvement Project

The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality submitted to us a grant application requesting new funding for the FY2002 consolidated grant. In that application, Wyoming asked for \$105,668 that it will use to pay for part of the cost of building the Greybull Sewer Improvements project. This project is a public facility in a community impacted by bentonite and typsum mineral mining activities. The requested funding is 50 percent of the project's total costs. Money for the balance of the project costs will come from the Town of Greybull (50 percent). The Governor of Wyoming certified the need and urgency to fund the Greybull Sewer Improvements project prior to completing the State's remaining inventory of non-coal reclamation, as allowed by section 411(f) of SMCRA. That certification says the project is in a community impacted by mineral mining activities. The project consists of replacement of old and failing clay tile sewer lines. Potential contamination of groundwater by sewage poses both a threat to human health and safety and a possible negative impact on the environment. I.

The Governor's certification states that the project meets the requirements for his certification under the authority of Wyoming Statute W.S. 35-11-1202(c) and the AML Regulations, Chapter VII, Section 6(c).

IV. How We Will Review Wyoming's Grant Application

We will review this grant application with respect to the regulations at 30 CFR 875.15, specifically subsections 875.15(e) (1) through (7). As stated in those regulations, the application must include the following information: (1) The need or urgency for the activity or the construction of the public facility; (2) the expected impact the project will have on Wyoming's coal or minerals industry; (3) the availability of funding from other sources and, if other funding is provided, its percentage of the total costs involved; (4) documentation from other local, State, and Federal agencies with oversight for such utilities or facilities describing what funding they have available and why their agency is not fully funding this specific project; (5) the impact on the State, the public, and the minerals industry if the facility is not funded; (6) the reason why this project should be selected before a priority project relating to the protection of the public health and safety or the environment from the damages caused

by past mining activities, and (7) an analysis and review of the procedures Wyoming used to notify and involve the public in this funding request, and a copy of all comments received and their resolution by the State. Wyoming's application for the Greybull Sewer improvements project contains the information described in these seven subsections.

Section 875.159(f) requires us to evaluate all comments we receive and determine whether the funding meets the requirements of sections 875.15(e)(1) through (7) described above. It also requires us to determine if the request is in the best interests of the State's AML program. We will approve Wyoming's request to fund this project if we conclude that it meets all the requirements of 30 CFR 875.15.

What To Do If You Want To Comment on the Proposed Project

We are asking for public comments on Wyoming's request for funds to pay for part of the cost of completing the Greybull Sewer Improvement project. You are welcome to comment on the project. If you do, please send us written comments. Make sure your comments are specific and pertain to Wyoming's funding request in the context of the regulations at 30 CFR 875.15 and the provisions of section 411 of SMCRA. You should explain any recommendations you make. If we receive your comments after the time shown under **DATES** or at locations other than the Casper Field Office, we will not necessarily consider them in our final decision or include them in the administrative record.

Dated: September 12, 2000.

Guy Padgett,

Director, Casper Field Office.

[FR Doc. 00-24382 Filed 9-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-34,013]

Alcatel Telecommunications Cable Roanoke, Virginia; Amended Notice of Negative Determination on Remand

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Negative Determination on Remand applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**. In the second paragraph, second sentence, of

the decision document, the Department inadvertently included an irrelevant citation, 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B). Accordingly, the notice of negative determination on remand is amended to delete the reference to 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B).

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of September 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00-24419 Filed 9-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-34,013]

Alcatel Telecommunications Cable Roanoke, Virginia; Notice of Negative Determination on Remand

On July 27, 2000, the United States Court of International Trade remanded this matter to the Secretary of Labor for further investigation in *Former Employees of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable v. Secretary of Labor*, No. 98-03-00540 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2000).

The Department's initial negative determination of eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance (TAA) for the workers and former workers of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable located in Roanoke, Virginia was issued on December 9, 1997 and published in the **Federal Register** on January 6, 1998, see 63 Fed. Reg. 577 (1998). The denial was based on the finding that criteria (3) of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B), were not met: *i.e.*, imports did not contribute importantly to the worker separations, and the company transferred production to another domestic location.

On remand, the court ordered the Department to undertake a full and complete investigation into the eligibility of former workers at Alcatel Telecommunications cable, Roanoke, Virginia to apply for trade adjustment assistance (TAA).

A complete investigation was undertaken, and the results of that investigation revealed that increased imports of singlemode optical fiber did not contribute importantly to the worker separations. Information provided by the company revealed that the company imports of singlemode optical fiber in 1998 were less than 2% of the 1997 production levels at the Roanoke

facility. Further, a survey of Alcatel's customers who were purchasing singlemode optical fiber for the U.S. market revealed that those customers did not increase their reliance on purchases of imported singlemode optical fiber.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the results of the remand investigation, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable, Roanoke, Virginia.

Signed at Washington, DC this 11th day of September 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00-24422 Filed 9-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-37,715; TA-W-37,715A]

Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, TN, and Mantachie, MS; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on June 20, 2000, applicable to workers of Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, Tennessee. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2000 (65 FR 45620).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that worker separations will occur at Murray, Incorporated's Mantachie, Mississippi facility when it closes in October, 2000. The workers are engaged in the production of bicycles.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers at Murray, Incorporated, Mantachie, Mississippi. The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Murray, Incorporated adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-37,715 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, Tennessee (TA-W-37,715)

and Mantachie, Mississippi (TA-W-37,715A) engaged in employment related to the production of bicycles who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 11, 1999 through June 20, 2002 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 13th day of September, 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00-24420 Filed 9-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA-W) issued during the period of September, 2000.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-37,940; Cloverland

Manufacturing, Inc., Escanaba, MI
TA-W-37,670; Berstone Knitting Mills,

Brooklyn, NY

TA-W-37,753; Spray Cotton Mills, Nova
Yarns Div., Eden, NC