proposed is a one-time effort incorporating three main components: A terrorist threat and risk assessment, a public health capabilities assessment, and an equipment needs and capabilities assessment. Information will be collected by approximately 9,000 local law enforcement, public health, and emergency management agencies. In addition, a state administrative agency in each state will roll-up the local data and submit this information to OJP/OSLDPS. Collection and tabulation of the raw data at the local level may take up to one month. Jurisdictions using the OJP data collection tool designed for this exercise may experience burdens ranging from 4–8 hours to collect tabulate and input data. In addition, roll-up of the data at the state level and electronic submission to OJP may take up to 4 hours.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total public burden associated with this one-time data collection will be approximately 66,200 hours.

If additional information is required, contact: Ms. Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 1220, National Place Building, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 2, 2000.

Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 00–14421 Filed 6–7–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

National Institute of Justice

[OJP(NIJ)–1279]

National Institute of Justice Announcement of the Tenth Meeting of the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence

AGENCY: Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Announcement of the tenth meeting of the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence.

DATES: The tenth meeting of the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence will take place on Sunday, July 9, 2000 from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.,EST, and on Monday, July 10, 2000 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., EST.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the Grand Hyatt Hotel, 1000 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Phone: (202) 584–1234.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher H. Asplen, AUSA, Executive Director. Phone: (202) 616–8123. [This is not a toll-free number].

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

This action is authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Sections 201–03, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3721–23 (1994).

Background

The National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence, established pursuant to Section 3(2)A of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), 5 U.S.C. App. 2, will meet to carry out its advisory functions under Sections 201–202 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. This meeting will be open to the public.

The purpose of the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence is to provide the Attorney General with recommendations on the use of current and future DNA methods, applications and technologies in the operation of the criminal justice system, from the crime scene to the courtroom. Over the course of its Charter, the Commission will review critical policy issues regarding DNA evidence and provide recommended courses of action to improve its use as a tool of investigation and adjudication in criminal cases.

The Commission will address issues in five specific areas: (1) The use of DNA in postconviction relief cases, (2) legal concerns including *Daubert* challenges and the scope of discovery in DNA cases, (3) criteria for training and technical assistance for criminal justice professionals involved in the identification, collection and preservation of DNA evidence at the crime scene, (4) essential laboratory capabilities in the face of emerging technologies, and (5) the impact of future technological developments in the use of DNA in the criminal justice system. Each topic will be the focus of the in-depth analysis by separate working groups comprised of prominent professionals who will report back to the Commission.

Dated: June 2, 2000.

Doug Horner,

Acting Director, National Institute of Justice.

[FR Doc. 00–14442 Filed 6–7–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37,011]

Cooper Energy Services, Grove City, Pennsylvania; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 27, 200, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former worker of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 4, 2000 (65 FR 25947).

Investigation findings show that the workers are primarily engaged in the production of castings and machined components. The worker were denied TAA because the ''contributed importantly'' test of the Group Eligibility Requirements of the Trade Act was not met. The workers were denied NAFTA–TAA on the basis that there was no shift in production to Mexico or Canada, nor were there company or customer imports of castings or machined components from Mexico or Canada.

The petitioners presented evidence that some of the production of pistons was shifted to Canada and is being returned to the United States.

New information obtained from the subject firm on reconsideration reveal that for a short period of time during which the machining centers were being transferred from Grove City, Pennsylvania, to another domestic location, the company source machined components from a Canadian firm. Other findings on reconsideration show that the company is increasing its reliance on castings from Mexico.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the new facts obtained on reconsideration, it is concluded that the workers of Cooper Energy Services, Grove City, Pennsylvania, were adversely affected by increased imports, including those from Canada and Mexico, of articles like or directly competitive with castings and machined components produced at the subject firm.

''All workers of Cooper Energy Services, Grove City, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 13, 1998, through two years from the date of this issuance, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974;'' and

''All workers of Cooper Energy Services, Grove City, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 13, 1998,

through two years from the date of this issuance, are eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.''

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of May 2000.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–14472 Filed 6–7–00; 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 May and June, 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 sub-division 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–37,582; Forge Products Corp., Cleveland, OH
TA–W–37,503; Swiss–M–Tex L.P., Travelers Rest, SC
TA–W–37,605; Hyperion Seating Corp., Lewisburg, TN
TA–W–37,573; Santa Cruz Industries, Santa Cruz, CA

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

TA–W–37,621; Westwood Lighting, Inc., El Paso, TX
TA–W–37,548; Red Plating, Inc., Providence, RI
TA–W–37,640; The Montana Power Co., Butte, MT
TA–W–37,561; Manpower Staffing Services, San Jose, CA

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–37,563; Tecumseh Products Co., Somerset, KY
TA–W–37,597; Lebanon Machine, Lebanon, OR

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name and location of each determination references the impact date for all workers of such determination.

TA–W–37,606 & A; Rocky Apparel LLC, Greenwood, MS and Ruleville, MS: March 28, 1999
TA–W–37,630; Motor Coils Manufacturing Co., Braddock, PA: April 17, 1999
TA–W–37,630; Motor Coils Manufacturing Co., Braddock, PA: April 17, 1999
TA–W–37,416; Triboro Electric Co L.P., Doylestown, PA: April 1, 2000
TA–W–37,609; TI Group Automotive Systems Corp., Valdosta, GA: March 28, 1999
TA–W–37,639; Peninsula Light Metals, LLC and Optima Wheels Formerly Known as Pacific Baja Light Metals, La Miranda, CA: April 29, 1999
TA–W–37,581; General Electric Industrial Systems, 60 Frame Area, Tell City, IN: March 9, 1999
TA–W–37,607; Henry I. Siegel, Inc., Bruceton, TN: April 30, 2000.
TA–W–37,448; Regal Ware, Inc., Jacksonville, AR: February 23, 1999
TA–W–37,552; Williamette Industries, Dallas, OR: May 29, 1999
TA–W–37,554; Ross Corp., Eugene, OR: March 25, 1999
TA–W–37,656; United Protective Clothing, Inc., Purvis, MS: April 11, 1999
TA–W–37,575; Southeastern Apparel Finishing, Inc., Johnson City, TN: March 20, 1999
TA–W–37,558; Exide Corp., Reading, PA: March 20
TA–W–37,569; National Castings, Cicero, IL: March 16, 1999
TA–W–37,362; Jasper Sportswear Corp., Brooklyn, NY: February 1, 1999
TA–W–37,647; The Eureka Co. Div. of White Consolidated Industries, Inc., Bloomington, IL: April 14, 1999
TA–W–37,477; Pinewood Casual, Inc., Philipsburg, PA: February 21, 1999
TA–W–37,535; Alliance Carolina Tool and Mold Corp., Arden, NC: March 22, 1999
TA–W–37,482; Quantum Corp., DLT and Storage Systems Group, Colorado Springs, CO: March 1, 1999
TA–W–37,530; Kellwood Co d/b/a American Recreation Products, Inc., Mineola, TX: March 23, 1999

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the month of May and June, 2000.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

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

(3) That imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or thereat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3)