1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, California 96093.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Schleusner at (530) 623–1800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 19, 2000, the Secretary, with concurrence of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, signed the ROD for the Program. The decision outlined in the ROD called for the implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which incorporated the recommendations developed in the TRFES and evaluated in the FEIS under the Flow Evaluation Alternative, coupled with additional watershed protection efforts identified in the Mechanical Restoration Alternative contained in the FEIS.

A component of the Flow Evaluation Alternative is a flow regime that is intended to achieve various anadromous fishery habitat objectives associated with meeting the goals of the Program. The recommended flow regime and the water year class, which determine the volume of water available in a given year, were developed from historic annual hydrologic records of the Trinity River watershed. Under the ROD, the water year class for any given year is determined based on the total water runoff (unimpeded flow) forecasted to occur in the Trinity River watershed above Trinity dam, as of April 1 of each year. The water year classes and expected probability of occurrence are stated in the chart above.

Appendix C of the FEIS sets out the process for the water year class forecast. On page C–4 the FEIS states: ''Annual basin runoff is calculated by summing the amount of runoff that has occurred form October 1 until April 1 and a volume of water that Reclamation forecasters predict (90 percent probability of exceedence) will run off during the months remaining in the water year (*i.e.* April through September) using the April 1 runoff forecast projection from the California Cooperative Snow surveys, California Department of Water Resources, Bulletin 120. Total water runoff is then compared to the ranges in Table 1 [of Appendix C] to designate the water year class.''

In fact, the 50% exceedence value enables a substantially more accurate forecast of a water year class than the 90% exceedence value. Program staff have determined that use of the 90% exceedence criterion would under-predict (*i.e.* predict a drier year than actually occurred) the actual water year class in 18 of the 49 years from which the necessary records were available to conduct the analysis. Of the 18 years, 8 years had later rain events in May or June.

The results of such under-prediction would negatively affect the successful implementation of the Program. The identification and evaluation of impacts associated with the alternatives evaluated in the FEIS were based on the historic hydrology of the Trinity River, and how that water was allocated between diversions to the Central Valley Project and flows down the Trinity River. The modeling of impacts associated with each alternative, especially with regard to impacts to water supply delivery and hydropower generation by the CVP for any given year class, was based upon what actually happened in that water year class historically, not upon what an April 1 forecast using a 90 percent exceedence criterion would have been.

As documented in the Final Report on the TRFES and in the FEIS, the majority of the geomorphic work to restore and maintain anadromous fishery habitat in the mainstem of the Trinity River is expected to occur during ''wet'' and ''extremely wet'' years. Continued use of the 90 percent exceedence criterion would result in a failure to experience the number of wet years anticipated by the ROD over the extended implementation of the Program, which would jeopardize the success of the Program.

Reclamation is correcting the reference to the April 1 exceedence criterion from 90 percent to 50 percent, based upon investigations by Program staff, with input from the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG). Program staff determined that use of the 50 percent criterion would correctly predict 44 of 49 of the years for which the necessary records were available. Additionally, of the remaining years, three resulted in underestimating the year class and two resulted in overestimating the year class. The resultant accuracy rate when using the 50 percent exceedence criterion is approximately 90 percent when compared to the historic record, with the errors almost balanced in over and under predicting the water year class. Thus the 50 percent exceedence criterion is approximately 90 percent accurate while the 90 percent exceedence criterion success rate is only slightly above 63 percent, with the errors consistently resulting in a prediction that is drier than that which ultimately occurs. This correction will not affect the decision adopted in the ROD or the supporting environmental analysis in the FEIS.

The Department hereby corrects the process by which the water year class is identified in the FEIS for the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Program in order to implement the alternative selected in the ROD for the Program. The correction replaces the 90 percent exceedence criterion used by Reclamation to forecast runoff in the Trinity River watershed as of April 1 of each year, with a 50 percent exceedence criterion.

Submitting Comments

The Secretary is not proposing to take any new action as a result of this **Federal Register** notice. Accordingly, while the Department welcomes comments, the Department is not establishing a specific date by which comments must be submitted. Public comments on other aspects of this Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management (AEAM) program may always be submitted to the TMC, the TAMWG, or the Executive Director.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from public disclosure, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold a respondent's identity from public disclosure, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public disclosure in their entirety.

Frank Michny,

Regional Environmental Officer, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. E6–6794 Filed 5–4–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–58,245 and TA–W–58,245A]

Agilent Technologies, Assurance Solutions, Roseville, CA and Colorado Springs, CO; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated January 26, 2006, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination

regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The negative determination notice applicable to workers of Agilent Technologies, Assurance Solutions, Roseville, California (TA–W–58,245) and Agilent Technologies, Assurance Solutions, Colorado Springs, Colorado (TA–W–58,245A) was signed on December 20, 2005, and published in the **Federal Register** on January 10, 2006 (71 FR 1556). The subject worker group develops software for the telecommunications industry.

The petition, filed on October 27, 2005, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met, and there was not a shift in production abroad.

The petitioner contends that software development should be considered production, that workers engaged in software writing and development should be considered as engaged in production and that production of software shifted to China, India and Scotland.

Since the issuance of the negative determination, the Department has revised its interpretation of an article to acknowledge that there are tangible and intangible articles and to clarify that the production of intangible articles can be distinguished from the provision of services. Software and similar intangible goods that would have been considered articles for the purposes of the Trade Act if embodied in a physical medium will now be considered to be articles regardless of their method of transfer.

In response to the request for reconsideration, a company official was contacted for clarification on the shift of software production abroad. The company official stated that, beginning in October 2005, production shifted abroad and software was being brought back into the United States from India and Scotland.

In accordance with Section 246 the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA for older workers. In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act, as amended, must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the information obtained in the reconsideration investigation, I determine that a shift of production followed by increased imports of software like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject workers contributed importantly to separations at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Agilent Technologies, Assurance Solutions, Roseville, California (TA–W–58,245), and Agilent Technologies, Assurance Solutions, Colorado Springs, Colorado (TA–W–58,245A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 27, 2004, through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 25th day of April, 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6–6819 Filed 5–4–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–58,893; TA–W–58,893V; TA–W–58,893W]

Agilent Technologies, Inc., Automated Test Group Semiconductor Test Solutions Including On-Site Leased Workers Of Voit, Santa Rosa, CA; Including Employees of Agilent Technologies, Inc. Automated Test Group, Semiconductor Test Solutions, Santa Rosa, CA; Located in Bethesda, MD; Located in Schaumburg, IL; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on March 29, 2006, applicable to workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Automated Test Group, Semiconductor Test Solutions, including on-site leased workers of Voit, Santa Rosa, California. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2006 (71 FR 19753).

At the request of a company official, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm.

New information shows that worker separations have occurred involving employees of the Santa Rosa, California facility of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Automated Test Group, Semiconductor Test Solutions located in Bethesda, Maryland and Schaumburg, Illinois. Ms. Laura Bodner and Mr. John Boehne provided marketing and sales support services for the production of Radio Frequency (RF) Content for the Agilent 93000 Tester at the Santa Rosa, California location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include employees of the Santa Rosa, California facility of the subject firm located in Bethesda, Maryland and Schaumburg, Illinois.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of the Santa Rosa, California location of the subject firm who was adversely affected by increased company imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–58,893 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Automated Test Group, Semiconductor Test Solutions, including on-site leased workers of Voit, Santa Rosa, California (TA–W–58,893) including employees of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Automated Test Group, Semiconductor Test Solutions, Santa Rosa, California located in Bethesda, Maryland (TA–W–58,893V) and Schaumburg, Illinois (TA–W–58,893W), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 22, 2005 through March 29, 2008, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 21st day of April 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6–6839 Filed 5–4–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P