needs of professionals working in the juvenile justice field. The needs assessment will capture information regarding the topics of interest to the field, the level of need for information about the topic, the types of training and technical assistance of interest around a topic, and the specific challenges that the field is facing in their work. The needs assessment utilizes an on-line format and incorporated skip patterns to ensure that each completion is tailored to the needs of the respondent and reduces the burden of time to complete the instrument. The information will be used to improve services and plan for future training and technical assistance efforts in a fiscally responsible manner that can provide the greatest benefit and impact.

(5) *An Estimate of the Total Number of Respondents and the Amount of Time Estimated for an Average Respondent to Respond/Reply:* It is expected that invitations for completion will be sent to approximately 6,000 respondents with a 60% response rate. This would indicate approximately 3,600 respondents who will require an average of 20 minutes to complete the needs assessment.

(5) *An Estimate of the Total Public Burden (In Hours) Associated with the Collection:*

The total annual public burden hours for this information collection is estimated to be 1200 hours.

If Additional Information is Required Contact: Lynn Bryant, Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Planning and Policy Staff, Justice Management Division, 601 D Street, NW., Suite 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E9–5239 Filed 3–10–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

[OMB Number 1121–NEW]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Assessing the Performance of Juvenile DNA System.

The Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for ''sixty days'' until May 11, 2009. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Simon Tidd, The Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, 2100 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Telephone interviews with state lab directors and SDIS administrators. Collection of summary statistics on juvenile DNA records within CODIS.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Assessing the Performance of Juvenile DNA System

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, No form number.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State Crime Lab Directors. Other: State CODIS personnel. The Urban Institute has been funded by the NIJ to examine the collection and use of juvenile DNA. We will establish the state-specific policies and practices through interviews with state lab personnel and non-identifiable summary data on the number of juveniles included in SDIS and the DNA crime matches attributed to that population. This data can then be used to assess the value of juvenile DNA records from the practitioner perspective and inform DNA policy decisions at the local, state, and Federal level.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* Interviews will occur with one state crime lab director and CODIS administrator in each state, for a total of 70 estimated respondents. Telephone interviews are expected to take 1 hour each (35 respondents). Summary statistic collection is expected to take 3 hours (35 respondents); 1 hour for discussion with us, 1.5 hours for the actually data pull, and .5 hours to format and transmit the summary statistics.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total estimated burden hours to complete both interviews and data collection is 140 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Planning and Policy Staff, Justice Management Division, 601 D Street, NW., Suite 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: March 6, 2009.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E9–5240 Filed 3–10–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–64,591]

Gensym Corporation, A Subsidiary of Versata Enterprises, Inc., Burlington, MA; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated February 20, 2009, the Division of Career Services, Trade Program Manager, Massachusetts, requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers'

eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on February 4, 2009 and will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that the worker group engaged in IT sales, consulting and support services, does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(a)(2) of the Act.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information regarding activities of the workers at the subject facility. The petitioners stated that workers of the subject firm produced software which was sold to customers.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine whether the workers of the subject firm were engaged in production of articles and whether they meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of March 2009.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–5181 Filed 3–10–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–63,344]

General Motors Corporation, Moraine Assembly Plant, Vehicle Manufacturing Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Allied Systems, Ltd and Securitas, Moraine, OH; 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 of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on June 5, 2008, applicable to workers of General Motors Corporation, Moraine Assembly Plant, Vehicle Manufacturing Division, Moraine, Ohio. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 20, 2008 (73 FR 35164). The certification was amended on December 4, 2008 to include on-site leased workers from Allied Systems, Ltd. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2008 (73 FR 76057–76058).

At the request of a petitioner, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers assemble Buick Rainiers, Chevrolet TrailBlazers, GMC Envoys, Isuzu Ascenders and Saab 9–7Xs.

New information shows that workers leased from Securitas were employed on-site at the Moraine, Ohio location of General Motors Corporation, Moraine Assembly Plant, Vehicle Manufacturing Division. The Department has determined that these workers were sufficiently under the control of the subject firm to be considered leased workers.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include leased workers from Securitas working on-site at the Moraine Assembly Plant, Vehicle Manufacturing Division, Moraine, Ohio location of the subject firm.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–63,344 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of General Motors Corporation, Moraine Assembly Plant, Vehicle Manufacturing Division, including on-site leased workers from Allied Systems, LTD, and Securitas, Moraine, Ohio, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 17, 2008, through June 5, 2010, 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 27th day of February 2008.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–5173 Filed 3–10–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–64,393]

Nikko America, Plano, TX; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated January 22, 2009, a petitioner 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 denial notice was signed on January 6, 2009 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 2, 2009 (74 FR 5871).

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 of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at Nikko America, Plano, Texas was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner in the request for reconsideration contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of the work performed by the workers of the subject firm. The petitioner stated that workers of the subject firm ''were responsible for final assembly of some products'', including ''putting batteries in the boxes where the toys were already located and placing decal stickers on the toys, taping them back up and distributing these products''. The petitioner further stated that Nikko decreased production of toys in 2008 and decided to import products directly to consumers bypassing the distribution center.

The investigation revealed that workers of Nikko America, Plano, Texas were engaged in warehousing, sales, distribution and service of radio controlled toys during the relevant period. No articles were produced by Nikko America in the United States. The subject firm imported all the products