produced primarily for the export market. Layoffs were the result of a loss in export sales by the subject firm. Furthermore, a survey of major declining domestic customers of the subject firm revealed that they did not increase import purchases of Douglas Fir planks while decreasing purchases from the subject firm.

The Department's denial of NAFTA–TAA for the same worker group 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 of 1974, as amended, were not met. There was no shift in production of lumber, primarily post and beams, from the subject firm to Mexico or Canada, nor were there company or customer imports of like or directly competitive products from Mexico or Canada.

The I.A.M. Woodworkers Local W–261 asserts that when the Coos Bay Export Sawmill experienced a sharp decline in sales to Japan, the company's focus was to increase domestic sales. For a while production levels became competitive, but the subject firm experienced high log costs and could not remain competitive. In order to determine worker group eligibility, the Department must examine the impact of imports of products like or directly competitive with those articles produced at the North Bend mill. Pricing and/or the cost of raw material is not a criterion for worker certification.

The I.A.M. Woodworkers Local W–261 also questioned the time period used for the survey of customers of the Coos Bay Export Sawmill and suggest that the time period include late 1996 and full year 1997. The survey covered the 1997 time period in which plank was produced by Coos Bay Export Sawmill for domestic sale.

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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 3rd day of April, 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–10529 Filed 4–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,989]

Allegheny Ludlum Corporation Leechburg, PA; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On February 23, 1998, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The petitioner presented new evidence regarding declines in employment at the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 16, 1998 (63 FR 12829).

The Department initially denied TAA to workers of Allegheny Ludlum Steel, Leechburg, Pennsylvania because the criterion (2) of the group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Sales and production at the subject firm did not decline. Employment remained unchanged since the September 8, 1997 expiration of the previous TAA certification (TA–W–31,231) for workers at the Leechburg plant.

On reconsideration, the Department requested that Allegheny Ludlum Steel provide data for January through September 1996, and full year 1997. Information provided by the company shows that employment at the Leechburg plant declined from 1996 to 1997. Production levels increased in January through September 1997 compared to the same time period of 1996, and increased in 1997 compared to 1996.

Statistics for electrical steel sheet and strip show that U.S. imports increased absolutely from 1996 to 1997, but the ratio of U.S. imports to U.S. shipments declined from 23.6 percent in 1996 to 21.8 percent in 1997.

Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Allegheny Ludlum Steel, Leechburg, Pennsylvania.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 3rd day of April, 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–10530 Filed 4–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,289]

CDR Ridgway, Ridgway, Pennsylvania; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

The Department, on its own motion, has reconsidered its negative determination in *United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO–CLC, and United Steelworkers of America, Local 13694* v. *Alexis Herman,* No. 97–09–01601, U.S. Court of International Trade. As a result of this reconsideration, the Department is now certifying the workers of CDR Ridgway in Ridgway, Pennsylvania as eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act.

The April 28, 1997, denial of TAA for workers of the subject firm was based on the finding that criterion (2) of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act was not met. Company-wide sales of pigments increased in 1996 compared to 1995. Layoffs were attributable to the parent company's decision to transfer the Ridgway pigment production to three other domestic locations.

New investigation findings show that although corporate-wide sales of pigments increased from 1995 to 1996, sales, production and employment at the Ridgway plant declined to zero when the plant closed in the first quarter of 1997. Accordingly, criteria (1) and (2) of Section 222 of the Trade Act are met.

On reconsideration, the Department conducted a survey of Ridgway's major declining customers. Survey results show that in 1996 compared to 1995, customers increased reliance on imports of pigments while decreasing purchases from CDR Ridgway, Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on remand, it is concluded that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with pigments produced at CDR Ridgway, Ridgway, Pennsylvania contributed importantly to the decline in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, I make the following revised determination:

"All workers of CDR Ridgway, Ridgway, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 19, 1996 through two years