assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 18th day of September 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24816 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,589]

Collins & Aikman Automotive Interior Systems, Canton, OH; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 22, 2001, the United Steelworkers of America, Local 550–L (U.S.W.A.), requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on February 16, 2001, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 5, 2001 (66 FR 38589).

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 Department initially denied the TAA to workers of the Collins & Aikman, Automotive Interior Systems, Canton, Ohio because the criterion (3) of the worker group eligibility requirement of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The Department's investigation disclosed that layoffs at the plant were attributable to the company's decision to transfer production of automotive floor mats from the Canton plant to other domestic facilities. Also, the company did not import like or directly competitive products. The workers at the subject firm were engaged in employment related to the production of automotive floor mats.

The petitioner, U.S.W.A., asserts that imports of automobiles were a major factor in the closing of the facility. Imports of automobiles, however, is not a basis for certification of workers producing floor mats under the Trade Act of 1974.

Additionally, the U.S.W.A. believes that all of the facts may not have been considered in the Department of Labor's TAA petition denial. In support, the petitioner stated Akro, the former name of the subject firm, was an original equipment manufacturer of automobile floor mats for new and domestic cars. The petitioner also attached a copy of a handwritten note dated March 14, 2001, requesting information on any product lines that were shipped out of the country. Subsequently, petitioner submitted a letter dated March 28, 2001, stating that several car mats for Ford and Volvo automobiles were transferred to a company in Europe by Akro, thus, creating a loss of jobs for Collins & Aikman employees through imports. The petition investigation, however, revealed the Collins & Aikman plant in Canton, does not import products like or directly competitive with the automobile floor mats which were produced in that plant. Nor did the subject firm shift production of those articles from Canton, Ohio, to facilities outside of the United States.

Finally, U.S.W.A. adds that former employees of the Shenango Furnace Company, Denver, Ohio, were found eligible to apply for TAA when the company moved to another domestic site. The petitioner is advised Shenango employees are not relevant to the workers at the Collins & Aikman 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 13th day of September 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24812 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–33–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,338]

Cooper Energy Services, Mount Vernon, OH; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

On April 10, 2001, the Department received a request from petitioner, for administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on March 16, 2001, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 16, 2001 (66 FR 19520).

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 Department initially denied TAA to workers engaged in the production of compressors, used in the oil industry, at Cooper Energy Services, Mount Vernon, Ohio, because the criterion (3) of the worker group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The subject firm, nor its customers, imported compressors.

The petitioner states that even though compressors are not being imported, the components that were machined in the Mount Vernon, Ohio, facility are now being machined in other countries and shipped back to Waller, Texas, for final assembly.

The petition was filed on behalf of the workers at the subject firm producing compressors, not machined components. Imports of materials to produce the finished articles is not relevant to this petition that was filed on behalf of workers producing compressors.

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 14th day of September 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24824 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,592; TA–W–38,592A]

Exide Technologies, Automotive Battery Division, AKA GNB Batteries, Inc., AKA Exide Corporation Farmers Branch, TX; Exide Technologies Oklahoma City Distribution Center, AKA GNB Batteries, Inc., AKA Exide Corporation Oklahoma City, OK, Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on January 31, 2001, applicable to workers of Exide Technologies, Automotive Battery Division, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation, Farmers Branch, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 2, 2001 (66 FR 13086).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of lead acid batteries.

New information shows that worker separations occurred at the Oklahoma City Distribution Center of Exide Technologies, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma when it closed in August, 2001. The Oklahoma City, Oklahoma location provided warehousing and distribution services for Exide Technologies; production facilities including Farmers Branch, Texas.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover the workers of Exide Technologies, Oklahoma City Distribution Center, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Exide Technologies, Automotive Battery Division, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation who were adversely affected by increased imports of lead acid batteries.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–38,592 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Exide Technologies, Automotive Battery Division, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation. Farmers Branch, Texas (TA–W–38,592) and Exide Technologies, Oklahoma City Distribution Center, aka GNB Batteries, Inc., aka Exide Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (TA–W–39,592A) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 10, 2000, through January 31, 2003, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of September, 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24818 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–38,600]

H.L. Miller and Son, Inc., Dallas, TX; Notice of Revised Determination of Reconsideration

By letter of April 18, 2001, the company, requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on March 12, 2001, based on the finding that the workers do not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 16, 2001 (66 FR 19520).

To support the request for reconsideration, the company provided evidence to show that the subject facility was a manufacturer of ladies dresses and sportswear prior to the closure of facility. Aggregate U.S. imports of ladies dresses and sportswear increased significantly during the relevant period. The import to shipment ratio for ladies dresses and sportswear was greater than 150 percent during the 2000 period.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at H.L. Miller and Son, Inc., Dallas, Texas, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of H.L. Miller and Son, Inc., Dallas, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 18, 2000 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.

Signed in Washington, DC this 20th day of September 2001.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–24815 Filed 10–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37,157]

The Chinet Company, Now Known as Huhtamaki Food Service, Inc., Waterville, ME; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on January 28, 2000, applicable to workers of The Chinet Company, Waterville, Maine. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 15, 2000 (65 FR 7564).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of laminated molded fiber frozen food trays. The company reports that in June, 2001, The Chinet Company became known as Huhtamaki Food Service, Inc. as a result of a 1999 merger.

Information also shows that workers separated from employment at the subject firm, had their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Huhtamaki Food Service, Inc.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification determination to properly reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of The Chinet Company, now known as