

Signed at Washington, DC this 3rd day of July, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18064 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-5480]

#### **AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 22, 2002, the company 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 26, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35144).

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 denial of NAFTA-TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of tools, dies, specialty tooling and injection molds at AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, Pennsylvania 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 tools, dies, specialty tooling and injection molds from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, Pennsylvania to Mexico or Canada. The survey conducted by the Department of Labor revealed that customers did not purchase products like or directly competitive with those produced at the Meadville plant from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that a customer of the subject plant is relocating to China and other countries in Southeastern Asia.

The shift in production to China and other countries by the customer is not a relevant factor in meeting the eligibility requirement of section 250 of the Trade Act.

The company further states that several companies (did not identify companies) located in the proximity of the subject firm have been certified for NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA) that sold similar products to the same customer as the subject firm.

The alleged NAFTA certifications of companies in the proximity of the subject firm may have been made for different reasons, such as a different product line, other customer(s) increasing their imports from Canada or Mexico or a shift in plant production to Canada or Mexico. Further review of the customer survey conducted by the Department of Labor during the initial investigation shows that the customer at issue did not report importing products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

#### **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 18th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18079 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-5918]

#### **Britax Heath Techna, Inc. Aircraft Interior Systems, Bellingham, WA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 23, 2002, the petitioners 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 22, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22113).

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 retrofitting various commercial aircraft interior components and services at Britax Heath Techna, Inc., Aircraft Interior Systems, Bellingham, Washington, was denied based on the workers not producing an article as required for certification under section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The petitioner alleges that the company was engaged in the production of a product. The petitioner indicated that the subject firm in combination of retrofitting aerospace interior components, also produced (OEM) Original Engineered Manufacturing Aerospace components. The petitioner further alleges that firm sales declined due to a decline in orders from foreign customers and a major U.S. aircraft manufacturer.

The Department of Labor upon further review of the initial decision and further contact with the company concurs with the petitioner that a portion of the work performed by the workers at the subject plant consisted of activities related to the production of a product (OEM Aerospace components).

A review of company data supplied during initial investigation and further contact with the company shows that there were no company imports of OEM Aerospace components from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from Bellingham, Washington to Mexico or Canada.

Further review of data supplied during the initial investigation, in conjunction with data recently supplied by the company, show that the subject firm's customers are located worldwide, with the overwhelming majority of sales directed towards foreign customers. Based on information provided by the company, a significant portion of the

declines in sales and production at the subject firm are attributed to a worldwide slow down in the airline industry during the relevant period, which thus impacted the retrofitting aerospace interior components business. The events of September 11, 2001 further impacted the demand for the subject firm's products.

Therefore, imports from Canada or Mexico of products "like or directly competitive" with what the subject plant produced did not "contribute importantly" to the layoffs at the subject 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 5th day of July 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18080 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA 5827]

#### Carey Industries, Inc., Danbury, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

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 of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on January 29, 2002 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Carey Industries, Inc., Danbury, North Carolina.

The petitioner 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 5th day of July, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18076 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA 6206]

#### IEC Electronics Corporation, Newark, NY; Notice of Termination of Investigation

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 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2331), an investigation was initiated on May 14, 2002, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at IEC Electronics Corporation, Newark, New York. The workers produce printed circuit boards.

A negative determination applicable to the petitioning group of workers was issued on March 27, 2002 (NAFTA-5649). No new information is evident which would result in a reversal of the Department's previous determination. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 5th day of June 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18075 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-5762]

#### JTD, Incorporated, Tigard, OR; Notice of Termination of Investigation

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 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 USC 2331), an investigation was initiated on

January 23, 2002 in response to a petition filed on the same date on behalf of workers at JTD, Incorporated, Tigard, Oregon.

The company official 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 5th day of July 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18077 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

Petitions for transitional adjustment assistance under the North American Free Trade Agreement—Transitional Adjustment Assistance Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103-182), hereinafter called (NAFTA-TAA), have been filed with State Governors under Section 250 (b)(1) of Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, are identified in the Appendix to this Notice. Upon notice from a Governor that a NAFTA-TAA petition has been received, the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance (DTAA), Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Department of Labor (DOL), announces the filing of the petition and takes action pursuant to paragraphs (c) and (e) of Section 250 of the Trade Act.

The purpose of the Governor's actions and the Labor Department's investigations are to determine whether the workers separated from employment on or after December 8, 1993 (date of enactment of Public Law 103-182) are eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA under Subchapter D of the Trade Act because of increased imports from or the shift in production to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing with the Director of DTAA at the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) in Washington, D.C. provided such request is filed in writing with the Director of DTAA not later than July 29, 2002.

Also, interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the