

The workers produced medium and heavy duty trucks. The workers were denied NAFTA-TAA on the basis that there was no shift in production (except for a temporary shift) to Mexico or Canada, nor did imports from Canada or Mexico contribute importantly to workers' separations.

The union provided additional information indicating that a shift in plant production occurred during the relevant period. Information provided by the company verified that there was a shift in business class truck production (cargo and cab-in-white for extended and crew cab) to Mexico during the relevant period. The shift in production to Mexico was the primary factor contributing to the layoffs at the subject plant. The workers were separately identifiable.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm to Mexico of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Freightliner LLC, Mt. Holly Truck Manufacturing Plant, Mt. Holly, North Carolina, engaged in activities related to the production of business class trucks (cargo and cab-in-white for extended and crew cab), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 10, 1999, through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 13th day of November 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01-30062 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-4523]

York International Corporation Portland, Oregon; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated June 26, 2001, the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, Local Union No. 16, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding

eligibility to apply for North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on June 7, 2001, and was published in the **Federal Register** on June 27, 2001 (66 FR 34257).

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 the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The denial of NAFTA-TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of custom air handling systems at York International Corporation, Portland, Oregon, was based on the finding that criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. There were no company imports of custom air handling systems from Mexico or Canada, nor did York International Corporation shift production from Portland, Oregon to Mexico or Canada. Major customers did not reduce their purchases from the subject firm.

The petitioner alleges that competitors of the subject plant import products like and directly with what the subject plant produced from Canada and Mexico. The Department normally analyzes the impact of imports on the subject firm workers through a survey of declining customers to examine if the firm's domestic customers switched purchases from the subject firm in favor of foreign produced products during the relevant period. There were no subject firm customers' sales declines during the relevant period. Therefore, any imports from Canada or Mexico are not a major contributing factor to the worker separations at the subject plant.

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 6th day of November 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01-30064 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

[Docket No. RM 2001-7A]

Disruption or Suspension of Postal or Other Transportation or Communications Services

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Determination of general disruption of postal services.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to newly promulgated 37 CFR 201.8, the Register of Copyrights announces her determination that there has been a general disruption or suspension of postal services that has delayed the receipt by the Copyright Office of deposits, applications, fees, and other materials submitted to the Office by means of the United States Postal Service.

DATES: The disruption of postal services commenced on October 18, 2001 and continues to the present.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David O. Carson, General Counsel, or Patricia Sinn, Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024-0400. Telephone: (202) 707-8380. Telefax: (202) 707-8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 4, 2001, the Copyright Office published in the **Federal Register** an interim regulation, to be codified at 37 CFR 201.8, addressing general disruptions or suspensions of postal or other transportation or communications services. The regulation implements 17 U.S.C. 709 and governs the circumstances under which the Register may assign, as the date of receipt for deposits, applications, fees and other materials submitted to the Office, the date on which the materials would have been received but for a general disruption or suspension of postal or other transportation or communications services.

The Register now publishes her determination that commencing on October 18, 2001, there has been a general disruption of postal services that has affected the delivery of deposits,

applications, fees and other materials submitted to the Office. Persons who believe that they have been adversely affected by the disruption of postal services should comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 201.8.

When the disruption of postal services has ended, the Register shall publish a determination to that effect.

In the meantime, persons desiring to ensure prompt receipt of materials by the Copyright Office are encouraged to use alternative means such as delivery by private carriers or personal delivery rather than the United States Postal Service.

Dated: December 3, 2001.

Marybeth Peters,

Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 01-30290 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-30-P

MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Commission Meeting

AGENCY: Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Commission will hold its next public meeting on Thursday, December 13, 2001, and Friday, December 14, 2001, at the Ronald Reagan Building, International Trade Center, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The meeting is tentatively scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on December 13, and at 9 a.m. on December 14.

Topics for discussion include: Quality improvement for health plans and providers; pass-through payments under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services; Medicare+Choice; measuring changes in input prices in traditional Medicare; adjusting local differences in resident training costs; paying for services in traditional Medicare; and assessing payment adequacy and updating Medicare payments.

Agendas will be mailed on December 4, 2001. The final agenda will be available on the Commission's web site (www.MedPAC.gov)

ADDRESSES: MedPAC's address is: 1730 K Street, NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20006. The telephone number is (202) 653-7220.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Ellison, Office Manager, (202) 653-7220.

Murray N. Ross,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 01-30040 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-BW-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-331]

Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Correction

The November 14, 2001 (66 FR 57115), **Federal Register** contained a "Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License." On page 57116, the date of September 24, 2001, should have been included in the list of supplemental letters to the application dated November 16, 2000.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of November, 2001.

Brenda L. Mozafari,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01-30111 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364]

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., et al.; Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8, issued to Southern Nuclear Operating Company Inc., et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Houston County, Alabama.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) for Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, and to delete license conditions that have been completed or are otherwise no longer in effect. These activities have now been completed and the license conditions are either obsolete or are no longer needed.

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated December 8, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

When the FOLs, NPF-2 and NPF-8, were issued to the licensee, the NRC staff deemed certain issues essential to safety and/or essential to meeting certain regulatory interests. These issues were imposed as license conditions in the FOLs, with deadlines for their implementation. Since the units were licensed to operate in the late 1970s and early 1980s, most of these license conditions have been fulfilled. For the license conditions that have been fulfilled, the licensee proposed to have them deleted from the FOLs.

The licensee also proposed to make changes to correct administrative errors such as words inadvertently omitted, documents erroneously cited, etc.

The proposed amendments involve administrative changes to the FOLs only. No actual plant equipment, regulatory requirements, operating practices, or analyses are affected by these proposed amendments.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the amendments are granted. No changes will be made to the design and licensing bases, and applicable procedures at the two units at the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, will remain the same. Other than the administrative changes, no other changes will be made to the FOLs, including the Technical Specifications.

The changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant