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 June 2002.

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–41,167; Tri-Way Manufacturing, Inc., El Paso, TX

TA–W–41,268; Truman Logging, Inc., Rexford, MT

TA–W–41,186; Swanson Erie Corp., Assembly Systems, Erie, PA

TA–W–40,150; Tyco Electronics, Global Application Tooling Div., A Subsidiary of Tyco Electronics Ltd, Mt. Sidney, VA

TA–W–41,316; Quality Components, Klamath Falls, OR

TA–W–41,259; Fibermark, Inc., Rochester, MI

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

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

TA–W–41,272; Amdocs, Inc., Hillsboro, OR

TA–W–40,846; Praxair, Inc., Niagara Falls, NY

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

TA–W–41,467; I.C. Isaac and Co., Inc., New York, NY

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

TA–W–41,569; ZF-Meritor, LLC, Meritor Clutch Co., Maxton, NC

TA–W–41,178; Pabst Brewing Co., Lehigh Valley Plant, Fogelsville, PA

TA–W–41,302; Motorola, Inc., Arlington Heights, IL

TA–W–41,032; Bard Manufacturing Co., Bryan, OH: ''All workers engaged in employment related to the production of finished full units are denied eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance''

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–41,032; Bard Manufacturing Co., Bryan, OH: ''All workers engaged in employment related to the production of air conditioning coils who became separated on or after January 10, 2001.

TA–W–41,108; Cedar Hill Manufacturing, Inc., Ansonville, NC: February 25, 2001.

TA–W–41,116; Standard Fusee Corp., d/b/a Orion Safety Products, South Beloit, IL: February 19, 2001.

TA–W–41,122; Cer-Tek, Inc., El Paso, TX: March 25, 2001.

TA–W–41,244; Turbon, Jetfill Div., Houston, TX: June 1, 2000.

TA–W–41,279; Levolor Kirsch Window Fashions, Newell Rubbermaid Div., Shamokin, PA: March 12, 2001.

TA–W–41,007; Emerson Appliance Motors, Exford, MS: January 8, 2001.

TA–W–41,009; Washington Frontier Juice, Prosser, WA: January 31, 2001.

TA–W–41,293; Pittsburgh Tool Steel, Inc., Monaca, PA: October 8, 2000.

TA–W–40,341; Meadowcraft, Inc., Somerton, AZ: November 1, 2000.

TA–W–40,526 and A; HMG Intermark Worldwide Manufacturing, Inc., Plant R–1, Reading, PA and Plant R–5, Reading, PA: October 23, 2000.

TA–W–40,840; Bradley Scott Clothes, Fall River, MA: October 26, 2000.

TA–W–41,233; Associated Garments LLP, Miami, FL: February 19, 2001.

TA–W–41,285; United States Enrichment Corp. (USEC), Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Piketon, OH: June 16, 2002.

TA–W–41,276; GBC Office Products Group, Ashland, MS: March 6, 2001.

TA–W–41,179; Pemco, Inc., Sheboygan, WI: February 14, 2001.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. 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 June, 2002.

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 threat 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) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA–TAA–06205; ZF-Meritor, LLC, Meritor Clutch Co., Maxton, NC
NAFTA–TAA–05955; Swanson Erie Corp., Assembly Systems, Erie, PA
NAFTA–TAA–05981; Truman Logging, Inc., Rexford, MT
NAFTA–TAA–05853; Tri-Way Manufacturing, Inc., El Paso, TX
NAFTA–TAA–05835; Pabst Brewing Co., Lehigh Valley Plant, Fogelsville, PA
NAFTA–TAA–05949; Schaeff, Inc., A Subsidiary of Terex, Sioux City, IA
NAFTA–TAA–06196; Bemis Manufacturing Co., Crandon Div., Crandon, WI
NAFTA–TAA–05974; Quality Components, Inc., Klamath Falls, OR

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 250(a) of the Trade Act, as amended.

NAFTA–TAA–05783; Maska U.S., Inc., A Subsidiary of The Hockey Co., Williston, VT
NAFTA–TAA–05764; J. Dashew, Inc., Baltimore, MD

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–06187; Honeywell International Garett Engine Boosting (Formerly Doing Business as Allied Signal), Garrett Engine Boosting Systems, Torrance, CA: April 14, 2002.
NAFTA–TAA–06113; Crossroad Knitting, Inc., Claudville, VA: April 15, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–06107; Modine Manufacturing Co., Emporia Facility, Emporia, KS: January 16, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–06102 & A; Harris Welco, Plastics Departmentm Kings Mountain, NC and Personnel Services Unlimited, Kings Mountain, NC (Employed in the Plastics Department, Harris Welco, Kings Mountain, NC): April 22, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–06063; Celestica, Inc., Westminster, CO: March 29, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–05978; Fourply, Inc., Plywood Div., Grans Pass, OR: March 8, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–5964; Levolor Kirsch Window Fashions, Newell Rubbermaid Div., Shamokin, PA: March 12, 2001.
NAFTA–TAA–05914; Cedar Hill Manufacturing, Inc., Ansonville, NC: February 15, 2001.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of June, 2002. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: July 3, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–17138 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41,024]

Whisper Jet Inc., Sanford, FL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 11, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Whisper Jet, Inc., Sanford, Florida.

The petitioner submitting the petition has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 26th day of June, 2002.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–17137 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–05773]

Superior Milling, Inc., Watersmeet, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 29, 2002, the employees requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 18, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22115).

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 mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The denial of NAFTA–TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of rough green lumber at Superior Milling, Inc, Watersmeet, Michigan was based on the finding that criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of Section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. There were no increased company imports of rough green lumber from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from the subject plant to Mexico or Canada. A survey of customers conducted by the Department of Labor revealed that customers did not increase their import purchase of products like or directly competitive with those produced at the Watersmeet plant from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that some customers of the subject plant imported rough green lumber during the relevant period. The petitioner also specifies which customers they believe are importing rough green lumber and thus impacting the subject plant.

A review of the initial investigation and the corresponding survey results conducted during the investigation shows that the company supplied a customer list that accounted for greater than 85% of the subject plant's sales for the years 2000 and 2001. Extrapolating the provided customer list sales from subject plant sales shows that the unreported customers as a group increased their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

During the initial investigation the Department of Labor surveyed the reported declining customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of rough green lumber during the relevant period (2000 and 2001). The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their imports of rough green lumber from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner further alleges that a major customer imported a sizeable amount of flooring stock from Canada and believes that those imports