



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

119457

HUMAN RESOURCES
DIVISION

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations.

B-208873

SEPTEMBER 10, 1982

The Honorable John Heinz
United States Senate

RELEASED



119457

Dear Senator Heinz:

Subject: Information on the 1974 Trade Act Worker Adjustment Assistance Program Certification Process (GAO/HRD-82-121)

This report responds to your March 12, 1982, request that we review the Department of Labor's recent administration of the petition certification (approval/denial) process under the worker adjustment assistance program authorized by the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2101). You were especially concerned about the decline in the number of petitions approved for benefits. We briefed your office on the information in this report on July 23, 1982.

In response to your request and as agreed with your office, we analyzed a 10-percent random sample, stratified by industry, of the 295 petitions denied during September and October 1981. In addition, we interviewed the Labor officials who were responsible for investigating, reviewing, and certifying the petitions in our sample. Information obtained is summarized below and detailed in enclosure I and the exhibits.

In calendar year 1980, Labor denied 62 percent of the petitions it investigated. The denial rate rose to 84 percent in calendar year 1981 and was 81 percent for the first 6 months of 1982. Our analysis showed that while Labor did not formally implement a policy to increase petition denials, some of its actions created an atmosphere that resulted in a more conservative application of the act's provisions in the review process.

We determined that several shortcomings in the petition certification process and other factors affected the increase in denials, but a lack of quantifiable information prevented a precise measurement of the degree to which these shortcomings or other factors contributed. The shortcomings include (1) not having specific criteria for applying that portion of the legislation relating to whether increased imports contributed importantly to worker separations, or the threat thereof, and to the absolute decrease in sales or production and (2) relying on data collected from a firm's customers to determine the impact of imports on such customers' purchases both individually and as a group. Such data, referred to as customer survey data, are usually not verified and often represent a relatively small percentage of a firm's sales.

(204802)

523338

The nature of petitions for assistance also affected the increase in denials during 1981. For instance, during 1980 many workers employed by automobile manufacturers were approved for benefits. This generated an influx of petitions from workers producing component parts for the automobile manufacturers. These petitions were denied because the Trade Act of 1974 does not permit petition approval for component parts based on increased imports of the finished product.

Other factors also contributed to Labor's increased denials of petitions. Among these were the administration's efforts to reduce Government spending, combined with the fact that fiscal year 1980 trade adjustment assistance expenditures ran about \$1.2 billion over the estimated fiscal year 1980 trade adjustment assistance budget (which tended to cause those evaluating the petitions to scrutinize them more closely and be more conservative in approving them), and the transfer of program responsibility from the International Labor Affairs Bureau to the Employment and Training Administration.

Labor will soon begin considering petitions under criteria established in the 1981 amendments to the Trade Act of 1974 as set forth in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35). Earlier program history and discussions with Labor officials indicate that application of the 1981 amendments' provisions may result in even higher denial rates because the new criteria for approval require that a cause (increased imports) for worker separation or decline in sales or production must not be less important than any other cause.

As requested by your office, official agency comments were not obtained from Labor on this report. However, we discussed the report's contents with Labor officials and included their views where applicable. Generally they concurred with our findings regarding the issues addressed.

As agreed with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 10 days from its issue date. At that time, we will send copies to interested parties and make copies available to others upon request.

Sincerely yours,


Gregory J. Ahart
Director

Enclosure

C o n t e n t s

Page

ENCLOSURE

I	INFORMATION ON THE 1974 TRADE ACT WORKER ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CERTIFICATION PROCESS	1
	Background	1
	Objective, scope, and methodology	2
	Shortcomings in certification process could lead to use of questionable data	3
	Limitations of customer survey data	4
	Fewer field investigations since 1980	5
	Flexibility in certification process affected denial rate	6
	Other factors contributed to increased denials during 1981	7
	Nature of petitions for assistance changed	7
	Administration efforts to reduce Government spending affected the program	8
	Transfer of program responsibility affected certification process	9
	Recent amendments to the act may cause increased denials	10

EXHIBIT

A	Trade adjustment assistance program expenditures by fiscal year	11
B	Trade adjustment assistance investigations completed and denials made by calendar year from April 1975 through June 1982	12
C	Trade adjustment assistance investigations completed and denials made by month for 1980, 1981, and 1982 through June	13
D	Petitions in our sample of September and October 1981 petition denials	14

ABBREVIATIONS

ETA	Employment and Training Administration
GAO	General Accounting Office
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
OTAA	Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance

INFORMATION ON THE 1974 TRADE ACTWORKER ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCEPROGRAM CERTIFICATION PROCESSBACKGROUND

The worker adjustment assistance program authorized by the Trade Act of 1974 was designed to provide benefits to workers whose jobs have been adversely affected by import competition. To apply for benefits, the workers file a petition for adjustment assistance with the Department of Labor. If Labor approves the petition, workers can receive (1) weekly cash allowances in addition to unemployment insurance benefits; (2) employment services, including counseling, testing, training, and job referral; and (3) job search and relocation allowances.

The program petition certification process authorized by the Trade Act of 1974 was administered by Labor's Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) from its beginning in April 1975 through May 1981. During that time, Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) was responsible for the delivery of benefits. Effective June 1981, the certification process was assigned to ETA.

The Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance (OTAA) is ETA's operating group responsible for administering the certification program. The Office is divided into three units--the Division of Investigations and Reports, the Division of Trade and Industry Analysis, and the Administrative Reports Staff. Petitions are assigned to investigators, who work in teams that are generally based on industry specialization.

Investigators report their findings to a team leader, who reviews them and recommends an approval or denial to the chief of the Division of Investigations and Reports. The chief then reviews the petition recommendation and forwards it to the director of OTAA. If the director agrees, he forwards the recommendation to a Labor official outside of OTAA (called a certifying officer) for final approval. If the director believes the facts do not support the recommendation, he will return the case to the investigator for further analysis. Both OTAA's organization and the petition certification process have remained the same under ILAB and ETA. Exhibit A shows the trade adjustment assistance program expenditures by fiscal year.

In calendar year 1980, OTAA completed 3,213 petition investigations and denied 1,985, or 62 percent. The denial rate rose to 84 percent in calendar year 1981, when OTAA denied 2,215 of the 2,626 petitions investigated. Through June 1982 the calendar year 1982 denial rate was about 81 percent. Exhibits B and C show

the number of investigations completed and denied by calendar year from April 1975 through June 1982 and by month from January 1980 through June 1982, respectively.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to answer Senator Heinz's specific concerns about how Labor handles the certification process and why the number of petitions approved for benefits has declined. In discussions with his office, we agreed to

- analyze a 10-percent random sample of the 295 petitions denied during September and October 1981 because the time frame for responding to his concerns did not allow for developing a sample which could be projected to the universe of calendar year 1981 petitions (see exhibit D),
- stratify the sample by industry to ensure that a variety of industries were represented,
- interview Labor's petition investigators and supervisors (team leaders) to determine the basis on which they recommended denying petitions,
- interview program managers who review and refer the recommendations to the certifying officers to determine if they are consistent in petition treatment, and
- interview certifying officers to determine the consistency of the decision reached with the reviewing official's recommendations.

We reviewed a random sample of 30 worker petitions that were denied in September and October 1981. We stratified the sample by industry to ensure that a variety of industries were represented. We discussed the sample petitions and the certification process with the 12 investigators and 6 team leaders who handled the petition investigations. In addition, we interviewed the chief of the Division of Investigations and Reports, the chief of the Division of Trade and Industry Analysis, the director of OTAA, and the three certifying officers responsible for approving the 30 sample petitions. We also analyzed statistics on Trade Act certification program activity that were obtained from OTAA's management information system. We did not verify these statistics.

- - - -

Our work was performed in accordance with GAO's current "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions."

SHORTCOMINGS IN CERTIFICATION
PROCESS COULD LEAD TO USE OF
QUESTIONABLE DATA

The process to determine whether workers are eligible to receive worker adjustment assistance begins when a group of workers, their union, or an authorized representative files a petition. In reviewing petitions, the Department of Labor must determine if increased imports are an important cause of unemployment. This causal link between declining sales or production and rising unemployment and imports is the principal factor distinguishing worker adjustment assistance from unemployment compensation.

The Trade Act of 1974 states that the Secretary of Labor shall certify a group of workers as eligible for adjustment assistance if a petition meets all of the following tests.

"(1) that a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated,

"(2) that sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

"(3) that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof contributed importantly to such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and to such decline in sales or production." (Underscoring supplied.)

OTAA develops an industry study and a customer survey report to be used in evaluating petitions to determine the eligibility of worker groups for assistance. The industry study is designed to show the level of like or directly competitive product imports in relation to the purportedly import-affected product. The customer survey report, which consists of data collected from a firm's customers, is intended to determine the impact of imports upon those customers' purchases both individually and as a group.

The industry study contains such information as the similar product's description, industry perspective, and level of import, export, production, and consumption data. We did not identify any problems with the industry studies.

The customer survey is compiled from data obtained from the customers of the firm whose workers have petitioned for trade adjustment assistance. The report's basic purpose is to help Labor determine if imports have "contributed importantly" to the sales/production and employment declines at a particular firm or

subdivision thereof. We found that the customer survey data had certain limitations and that fewer field investigations have been made since 1980.

Limitations of customer survey data

OTAA officials recognize the customer survey's limitations. They must rely on the firm and the customers to provide data that the investigators often are not able to verify. Also, the customer responses sometimes represent a relatively small nonprojectable sample of the firm's sales. In addition, the process of obtaining data from the firm and its customers is time consuming. OTAA has made improvements, such as obtaining customer data by mailgram, to speed up and increase the number of responses, but the customer survey data still have limitations.

Once assigned to investigate a petition, an investigator must determine if a customer survey is essential to the process. Sometimes a customer survey is not necessary, either because of the nature of the firm's customers or because data obtained during a visit to the firm would clearly show that a significant number of workers have not been separated or that sales or production have not declined. If a customer survey is needed, the investigator can compile the customer list during a visit to the firm or request that the firm provide it. After compiling or obtaining the list, the investigator requests the Division of Trade and Industry Analysis to survey the firm's customers.

The investigator's initial difficulty is obtaining a customer list for the firm whose workers have submitted a petition. Firms are often reluctant to provide customer lists because they consider such information to be confidential and because compiling the list is time consuming. Once the customer list is obtained, the investigator must wait for the customers to respond regarding their domestic and foreign purchases and then for the data to be summarized by the Division of Trade and Industry Analysis.

Of the 30 petitions in our sample, 18 had customer surveys. The time that expired between when the survey was requested until when it was received ranged from 1 month to 9 months and averaged 5 months.

Of the 12 investigators, 2 were critical of the inaccuracies they have found in the customer surveys, and another pointed out that customer responses are not followed up even when data appeared to be inconsistent. Three of the six team leaders indicated a lack of timeliness in receiving customer survey reports. One stated that errors have been noted in the data, and another said getting customers to compile reliable information is difficult.

The director of OTAA acknowledged that the problems of timeliness and accuracy in the customer surveys are one of his major concerns. However, he emphasized that the investigators are responsible for ensuring that the customer survey data are accurate.

In addition, the customers responding to the survey sometimes represent a relatively small percentage of the sales for the subject firm. The chief of the Investigations and Reports Division told us that this problem occurs frequently in the apparel industry, where firms serve many customers and the amount of sales to each may be relatively small. Our cases provided examples where the survey represented a small nonprojectable sample of a firm's sales. In our sample, six cases had customer surveys which represented less than 30 percent of the firms' sales. The sales represented in these cases ranged from 2.8 to 26.1 percent.

Fewer field investigations since 1980

The field investigation is a visit to the firm whose workers have filed the petition for assistance. The field investigation's purpose is to make contact with the individual responsible for submitting the required data and develop detailed information regarding company history, organization, and plant facilities and a detailed product description.

Eleven of the 12 investigators, all 6 team leaders, and OTAA officials we interviewed agreed that field investigations contribute positively to the petition certification process. Six team leaders and 11 investigators told us that they are able to obtain better data relating to the customer survey by making field investigations than by accepting the data that the firm submits. Also, 5 team leaders and 10 investigators stated that better sales, production, and employee information could be obtained on site. Other advantages to field investigations cited by team leaders and investigators were the ability to verify information and to become more familiar with the firm's operation.

Reasons given for the decrease in field investigations since 1980 included budget restrictions, the backlog of cases, and the different types of cases. The OTAA director told us that the budget restrictions and the backlog were the primary reasons. He said that in about mid-1981 Labor restricted travel, but he pointed out that, because OTAA needed to reduce the backlog of cases, the investigators were limited in their travel. Others believed that fewer petitions required visits because the types of cases had changed. One example was the large number of auto dealership petitions investigated during 1981. After OTAA determined that independently owned dealerships were to be denied, visits to the dealerships were not necessary.

FLEXIBILITY IN CERTIFICATION
PROCESS AFFECTED DENIAL RATE

The lack of specific criteria for applying the portion of test 3 relating to whether increased imports contributed importantly to worker separations and to the absolute decrease in sales or production has permitted flexibility in interpreting this legislative requirement for petition approval. This interpretative flexibility has resulted in Labor recently denying borderline cases (i.e., based on the data, one could argue for either approval or denial) which, according to investigators and team leaders, would probably have been approved before calendar year 1981. The customer survey is used to ascertain whether imports have contributed importantly, and the limitations of the survey data add to the flexibility. Borderline cases accounted for about 13 percent of the petitions we sampled.

A great deal of flexibility exists in applying the "contributed importantly" test. The OTAA Investigators Manual states that this is the most difficult of the three tests to apply because one can be flexible in determining the extent of "contributed importantly." The manual further states that attempting to define specific procedures for determining whether this test has been met is not practical.

The director stressed that the act's legislative history gives little guidance on the meaning of contributed importantly. Accordingly, he believes that each petition must be handled on a case-by-case basis because each case is unique and the factors must be considered together. He stated that flexibility exists because more than one set of data may be applied to satisfy the criteria. For example, other tests being met, if customer survey results seem conclusive and show that sales decreased absolutely, then sufficient data would exist to approve the petition. On the other hand, if the customer survey results are inconclusive or weak because of shortcomings in the way the data were obtained, other data may be used to make the decision. For instance, if aggregate import data are strong and reveal growing import penetration and the firm supplies a national market, the "contributed importantly" criteria could be viewed as being satisfied. With the same customer survey result, if the aggregate import data did not reveal a strong import penetration or the firm did not supply a national market, the "contributed importantly" test might not be satisfied.

All of the team leaders and investigators we interviewed stated that considerable flexibility has existed in applying the "contributed importantly" test because no specific criteria exist to guide them. Of our 30 sample cases, 4 that were denied were considered by the investigators and team leaders to be borderline because the customer survey data were inconclusive.

Eight of the investigators we interviewed said borderline cases that would have been approved before the start of 1981 have been denied since. They told us that this practice was caused by the changed atmosphere brought about by a new administration and was permitted by the flexibility in the certification process. Three of the six team leaders interviewed also stated they are aware of petitions that were denied during calendar year 1981 that would have been approved earlier. The chief of the Investigations and Reports Division stated that during the program's early years there was a tendency to certify the borderline cases, whereas since the beginning of 1981 the tendency has been to deny them.

OTHER FACTORS CONTRIBUTED TO
INCREASED DENIALS DURING 1981

Other factors contributing to the increase in petition denials included

- the change in the nature of petitions for assistance,
- the impact of administration efforts to reduce Government spending, and
- the effect of the transfer of program responsibility on the certification process.

Because of a lack of quantifiable information, we were not able to measure the degree to which each of these factors contributed to the increase in denials. The following sections explain how each factor affected the denial rate.

Nature of petitions
for assistance changed

A major cause cited by OTAA officials for the increase in denials was that early in calendar year 1980 they approved petitions covering a large number of workers employed by automobile manufacturers. OTAA officials indicated that the publicity created by approving benefits for these workers prompted an influx of petitions later that year from worker groups producing automobile component parts for domestic automobile manufacturers as well as from automobile dealerships. Many of these petitions alleged that decreases in component part sales had resulted from increases in foreign automobile imports. However, the Trade Act of 1974 does not permit petition approvals for component parts based on increased imports of the related finished product. To come under the act, these cases would have to involve increases in imported component automobile parts that were like or directly competitive. The petitions received in 1980 would have affected the 1981 denial rate because about a year lapses between institution of the petition and denial. The average time between institution of a petition and denial was 327 days for our sample petitions.

OTAA officials indicated that they denied many petitions from worker groups producing automobile component parts. They gave us statistics showing the number of petitions approved and denied during 1980 and 1981 for automobile component parts. In 1980, Labor approved 484 auto-related petitions and denied 551; in 1981, it approved 67 and denied 689 such petitions.

The director of OTAA pointed out that the statistics were compiled for us according to industry classification codes for auto-related cases only. According to him, many other petitions relating to other industry classifications investigated during 1981 indicated that sales had been affected by increased imports of foreign automobiles. He cited steel and rubber as examples of industries attributing sales decreases to such increased imports. However, OTAA did not have statistics showing the overall effect of the automobile component parts petitions. Many of the investigators and team leaders we interviewed indicated that these petitions contributed to the increase in denials in 1981.

In addition, many petitions submitted by worker groups from automobile dealerships were denied. These groups were claiming that foreign automobile imports had caused an increase in worker separations at the automobile dealerships. Such worker groups could not be approved for benefits unless the dealership was owned by the firm which produced the automobile; consequently, many of these petitions were ineligible for approval.

Also, changes in imports influenced the type of worker groups affected. For example, an OTAA official stated that during 1981 many petitions were received from worker groups producing fabricated steel products. Labor determined that, although imports of primary steel in prior years had affected the production and sale of domestic primary steel, imports of various fabricated steel products had not affected the production of domestically produced primary steel. Consequently, many of these petitions were denied. This situation also applied to petitions involving apparel, as well as wooden shingles and shakes, 1/ because imports of like or directly competitive products did not contribute importantly to the decline in sales or production.

Administration efforts to
reduce Government spending
affected the program

Although no evidence indicated direct pressure to deny petitions, our interviews with the individuals responsible for investigating and recommending whether to approve or deny petitions indicated that the atmosphere created by the new administration's

1/A wood or asbestos board laid in overlapping rows to cover roofs or walls.

emphasis on budgetary constraints contributed to the increased denial rate. Seven of the 12 investigators and 3 of the 6 team leaders we interviewed agreed that this was a factor. In addition, this emphasis, when combined with a projected \$1.2 billion expenditure level over the estimated 1980 OTAA budget, tended to cause those evaluating the petitions to scrutinize them more closely and be more conservative in approving them.

Transfer of program responsibility
affected certification process

During 1981 the delegation of authority and assignment of responsibility for administering the petition certification process was reassigned from ILAB to ETA. Although day-to-day operations did not change, the reassignment brought about higher level review of documents related to petition decisions. According to investigators we interviewed, the emphasis on higher level reviews led many to believe that the Department was leaning toward denying petitions involving more than 50 workers.

Before June 1, 1981, operating responsibility for Labor's worker adjustment assistance program was divided between ILAB and ETA. In accordance with this arrangement, ILAB investigated worker petitions and determined the eligibility of workers applying for trade adjustment assistance. The actual assistance provided to workers--including cash trade adjustment allowances; training opportunities; employment services, such as counseling, testing, and job placement services; and relocation allowances--was provided by ETA through State Employment Security Agencies.

In Labor's view, this divided responsibility made it more difficult to establish accountability for activities under the Trade Act. Accordingly, OTAA was transferred to ETA, the predominant operating component. Currently, the certification process is handled by OTAA, while the benefit aspect is handled by the Unemployment Insurance Service.

With the reassignment of program responsibilities, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training was delegated authority and responsibility for coordinating, monitoring, and insuring that the Secretary of Labor's functions under the Trade Act are carried out. As such, immediately after the transfer the Assistant Secretary asked to be apprised of the assistance being provided under the program. Because of concern over the program's large expenditures, the Assistant Secretary decided to review all documentation related to petitions affecting 50 or more workers recommended for approval. This was not the practice in ILAB.

Within a month after this practice was implemented, it was determined not to be necessary. The practice was modified so that only petitions recommended for approval involving over 500 workers, as well as other petitions that the director of OTAA believed

should be reviewed by the Assistant Secretary, were sent to him for review. The director of OTAA, and the certifying officers we interviewed, could not recall a written directive outlining the practice of forwarding cases to the Assistant Secretary, and they believed it originated from an oral request.

Seven of the investigators and four of the team leaders we interviewed were aware of what was referred to as the "Fifty Worker Rule." The rule apparently originated from the fact that petitions involving more than 50 workers were being reviewed more thoroughly. OTAA investigators and team leaders interpreted this to mean that the Department was leaning toward denying such petitions. For example, one team leader told us that petitions involving more than 50 workers needed to have a stronger basis for approval than petitions involving fewer workers.

RECENT AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT
MAY CAUSE INCREASED DENIALS

The 1981 amendments to the Trade Act, as set forth in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, changed the criteria for approving a petition. In section 222(3), which read "contributed importantly to such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and to such decline in sales or production," the words "contributed importantly" were changed to "substantial cause." The term "substantial cause" is defined as a cause which is at least as important as any other cause. While the amendments became effective on October 1, 1981, they stipulated that the substantial cause criteria be applied to petitions filed after February 8, 1982.

OTAA officials stated that when they begin investigating petitions and applying the "substantial cause" criteria, they expect the denial rate to increase even more. At the close of our fieldwork in mid-July 1982, OTAA had not begun investigations on this basis because of the backlog of petitions that came in under the old criteria.

Early history of the program indicates that concerns over the tighter criteria could be well founded. Eligibility criteria set forth in the 1962 Trade Act required a demonstration that increased imports were the major factor in causing injury to an industry, firm, or group of workers and that concessions granted under trade agreements were the major cause of the increase in imports. A private study indicated that these criteria severely limited the approval of trade adjustment assistance benefits. In fact, under the 1962 Trade Act about 40,000 workers received benefits, compared to about 1.3 million workers receiving \$3.9 billion in benefits through fiscal year 1981 under the 1974 Trade Act.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMEXPENDITURES BY FISCAL YEAR (note a)

<u>Fiscal year</u>	<u>Petitions approved</u>	<u>Workers paid</u>	<u>Amount paid</u>	<u>Average payment per worker</u>
1976	381	62,362	\$ 79,359,264	\$1,272
Transition quarter	44	46,900	71,039,569	1,515
1977	401	110,705	147,961,567	1,337
1978	698	155,769	257,312,265	1,652
1979	950	132,188	256,096,165	1,937
1980	924	531,736	1,622,171,749	3,051
1981	<u>375</u>	<u>281,073</u>	<u>1,440,049,387</u>	5,123
Total	<u>3,773</u>	<u>1,320,733</u>	<u>\$3,873,989,966</u>	\$2,933

a/ Statistics were obtained from the Unemployment Insurance Service, Office of Special Programs, which maintains the cash payment data base and have not been verified by GAO.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE INVESTIGATIONSCOMPLETED AND DENIALS MADE (note a) BYCALENDAR YEAR FROM APRIL 1975 THROUGH JUNE 1982

	<u>Investigations completed</u>		<u>Denials</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Workers</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Workers</u>
1975 <u>b/</u>	241	111,211	109	45	50,727
1976	933	210,039	438	47	60,711
1977	1,060	228,665	601	57	74,294
1978	2,008	246,656	1,013	50	78,505
1979	2,073	292,979	1,070	52	73,832
1980	3,213	770,020	1,985	62	187,300
1981	2,626	316,549	2,215	84	274,485
1982	726	81,870	586	81	69,151
Total	<u>12,880</u>	<u>2,257,989</u>	<u>8,017</u>	62	<u>869,005</u>

a/Statistics were obtained from the OTAA management information system and have not been verified by GAO.

b/Investigations were begun in April 1975, but cash payments were not made until fiscal year 1976.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE INVESTIGATIONS
COMPLETED AND DENIALS MADE (note a) BY MONTH
FOR 1980, 1981, AND 1982 THROUGH JUNE

	<u>Investigations completed</u>		<u>Denials</u>		
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Workers</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Workers</u>
1980:					
Jan.	219	19,649	138	63	9,789
Feb.	188	29,160	120	64	15,737
Mar.	163	38,796	101	62	10,719
Apr.	272	252,416	137	50	20,500
May	273	204,123	163	60	14,206
June	202	27,492	130	64	16,616
July	265	45,705	176	66	13,305
Aug.	416	42,047	242	58	16,086
Sept.	346	24,256	204	59	11,666
Oct.	377	37,797	254	67	23,080
Nov.	257	28,486	154	60	18,595
Dec.	235	20,093	166	71	17,001
Total	<u>3,213</u>	<u>770,020</u>	<u>1,985</u>	62	<u>187,300</u>
1981:					
Jan.	287	23,437	254	89	21,516
Feb.	243	32,917	196	81	28,907
Mar.	254	29,437	206	81	22,150
Apr.	272	37,410	224	82	27,953
May	288	31,521	237	82	25,463
June	310	48,736	265	85	44,197
July	125	18,404	110	88	17,353
Aug.	174	24,301	153	88	23,216
Sept.	162	19,528	142	88	18,918
Oct.	190	15,852	153	81	11,704
Nov.	156	19,052	137	88	18,383
Dec.	165	15,954	138	84	14,725
Total	<u>2,626</u>	<u>316,549</u>	<u>2,215</u>	84	<u>274,485</u>
1982:					
Jan.	66	8,973	53	80	8,180
Feb.	86	12,529	67	78	11,579
Mar.	125	19,585	106	85	16,632
Apr.	148	13,432	116	78	9,851
May	141	17,637	117	82	15,043
June	160	9,714	127	79	7,866
Total	<u>726</u>	<u>81,870</u>	<u>586</u>	81	<u>69,151</u>

a/Statistics were obtained from the OTAA management information system and have not been verified by GAO.

PETITIONS IN OUR SAMPLE OF SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER 1981 PETITION DENIALS

Case number	Product classification	Location	Estimated number of workers affected	Reason for denial	Date instituted	Date denied	Days elapsed from date instituted to denial	Field investigations made	Customer survey		Respondents' share of firm's sales	
									Polled	Responding	Year	Percent
1	Apparel	New Jersey	4	Worker separations were insignificant	8-18-80	10-6-81	415	No	8	7	1979 1980 1st qtr. 1981	100 100 100
2	Apparel	New York	10	Imports did not contribute importantly	8-25-80	9-9-81	381	No	1	1	1978 1979 1980	100 100 100
3	Apparel a/	Pennsylvania	30	Imports did not contribute importantly	10-14-80	10-27-81	379	No	11	10	1979 1980	17.2 26.1
4	Apparel	Louisiana	174	Imports did not contribute importantly	12-31-80	10-6-81	280	No	27	15	1979 1980	37.9 23.2
5	Apparel	Connecticut	74	Imports did not contribute importantly	11-24-80	9-8-81	289	Yes		(b)		(b)
6	Primary Metal Industries	Pennsylvania	180	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-22-80	10-6-81	380	No		(b)		(b)
7	Primary Metal Industries a/	Ohio	8	Imports did not contribute importantly	8-31-81	10-16-81	c/47	Yes		(b)		(b)
8	Primary Metal Industries	Oregon	225	Imports did not contribute importantly	10-31-80	10-22-81	357	No	10	9		(d)
9	Primary Metal Industries	Michigan	43	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-22-80	10-13-81	387	No	2	2	1978 1979 1980	100 100 100
10	Primary Metal Industries a/	Michigan	1,308	Imports did not contribute importantly	7-14-80	9-23-81	437	No	10	5		(d)
11	Fabricated Metal Products	Indiana	60	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-29-80	10-13-81	380	No	1	1	1978 1979 1980	79 97.5 (b)
12	Fabricated Metal Products	Ohio	113	Imports did not contribute importantly	11-28-80	9-8-81	285	Yes	57	43	1978 1979 1980	2.8 6.2 20.8
13	Fabricated Metal Products	Indiana	75	Sales did not decrease--worker separations were insignificant	10-14-80	10-6-81	358	No	4	4	1980 1981	95 95
14	Machinery	Illinois	520	Imports did not contribute importantly	11-24-80	10-13-81	324	No		(b)		(b)
15	Machinery	Wisconsin	228	Imports did not contribute importantly	10-31-80	10-29-81	364	No		(b)		(b)

Case number	Product classification	Location	Estimated number of workers affected	Reason for denial	Date instituted	Date denied	Days elapsed from date instituted to denial	Field investigations made	Customer survey		Respondents' share of firm's sales	
									Polled	Responding	Year	Percent
16	Machinery	Ohio	400	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-29-80	9-22-81	359	No	40	27	1977 1978 1979	6 6 3.5
17	Machinery	Ohio	60	Imports did not contribute importantly	11-10-80	9-29-81	324	No	6	6	1979 1980	70 70
18	Automobile Dealer	Arkansas	20	Firm did not produce an article	12-22-80	9-28-81	281	No	(b)			(b)
19	Automobile Dealer	Ohio	35	Firm did not produce an article	10-31-80	9-11-81	316	No	(b)			(b)
20	Automobile Dealer	Wisconsin	85	Firm did not produce an article	2-9-81	9-21-81	225	No	(b)			(b)
21	Automobile Dealer	Montana	26	Firm did not produce an article	7-13-81	10-13-81	93	No	(b)			(b)
22	Automobile Dealer	Missouri	40	Firm did not produce an article	8-4-80	9-18-81	411	Yes	(b)			(b)
23	Transportation Equipment	New York	500	Imports did not contribute importantly	8-25-80	9-10-81	382	Yes	39	28	1979 1980	47.3 47.1
24	Textile Mill Products a/	Virginia	70	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-8-80	10-29-81	417	No	55	36	1979 1980	12.5 11.6
25	Textile Mill Products	New York	3	Firm did not produce an article	11-24-80	10-6-81	317	No	(b)			(b)
26	Leather Products	Missouri	66	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-15-80	9-28-81	379	No	30	21	1979 1980	10.8 (d)
27	Stone, Clay, Glass, and Concrete	Indiana	45	Imports did not contribute importantly	9-8-80	10-13-81	401	No	18	14	1979 1980	67.5 79.8
28	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	New York	14	Imports did not contribute importantly	1-12-81	10-28-81	290	No	36	23	1978 1979 1980	30 17 11
29	Railroad Transportation	Michigan	10	Firm did not produce an article	1-30-81	10-22-81	266	No	(b)			(b)
30	Wholesale Trade/ Durable Goods	Indiana	200	Imports did not contribute importantly	11-28-80	9-8-81	285	No	70	58		(d)

a/Case was considered borderline denial by investigators and team leaders.

b/Customer survey not necessary because petition was denied on other factors, such as sales, production, and/or employee data, or survey data not comparable to previous year.

c/Petition for this warehouse was received after the petition for the firm's plant had been in process for 10 months.

d/Information not available in the files.