Federal Register. The Commission's determination regarding initiation of review investigations is due within 30 days of the close of the comment period. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request business confidential treatment under § 201.6 of the Commission's rules.[6] Such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. Each sheet must be clearly marked at the top ''Confidential Business Information.'' The Commission will either accept the submission in confidence or return it. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

Copies of the non-confidential version of the request and any other documents in this matter are available for public inspection during regular business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary to the Commission; telephone 202–205–2000.

Issued: May 12, 1998.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13426 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[6] 19 CFR 201.6.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,214 and NAFTA–02157]

Fort James Corp., Towel and Tissue Division, Ashland, WI; Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 27, 1998, the United Paperworkers International Union (UPIU) Local 1104 requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notices were signed on March 11, 1998. The TAA and NAFTA–TAA decisions were published in the **Federal Register** on April 3, 1998, (63 FR 16574) and (63 FR 16575), respectively.

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department was based on the binding that the ''contributed importantly'' test of the worker group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met for workers of Fort James Corporation, Ashland, Wisconsin producing commercial napkins. The ''contributed importantly'' test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The Department of Labor surveyed the major declining customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of commercial napkins. None of the respondents reported import purchases of commercial napkins in 1996, 1997 or in January 1998.

The subject firm workers were denied eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA 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 commercial napkins 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 UPIU Local 1104 asserts that some of the machinery at the Ashland mill is scheduled for delivery to China and Europe by the end of summer 1998. The shipment or sale of production equipment to foreign countries is not a basis for a worker group certification under the Trade Act of 1974.

The UPIU Local 1104 provided import statistics for tablecloths and table napkins made of paper for 1997. this information does not substantiate import impact for workers of Fort James Corporation. There must be company or customer increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by workers at the subject firm.

The UPIU Local 1104 asserts that during the petition investigation, the customer list provided by the company did not include all of the Fort James Corporation Ashland customers. The customer list requested by the Department and provided by company officials accounted for Ashland's major declining customers.

Finally, the UPIU Local 1104 asserts that prices for market pulp and paperboard has increased, thereby affecting company cost to compete for materials used in the production of commercial napkins. Price of raw materials to produce a product is not a basis for a worker group certification under the Trade Act of 1974.

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 4th day of May 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–13419 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

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 April, 1998.

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 subdivision 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 separation, 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–34,104; Sunbeam Corp., Murfreesboro, TN

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

TA–W–34,461; ARC USA, Pauls Valley, OK

TA–W–34,193; Kat-Em International, A Division of Concord Fabrics Inc., Los Angeles, CA

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

TA–W–34,318; Streamline Fashions Mfg., Inc., Philipsburg, PA

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

TA–W–34,223; Geneva Steel, Provo, UT

the investigation revealed that criteria (2) and criteria (3) have not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification. Increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have not contributed importantly to the separations or threat thereof, and the absolute decline in sales or production.

TA–W–34,481; Renfro Corp., Barber Plant, Mt. Airy, NC

Renfro Corp. Officials made a decision to close it's Barber plant and transfer all production to another domestic plant.

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

TA–W–34,376; Beam Corp., A Div. Of Deena Corp., Tolleson, AZ: March 19, 1997.

TA–W–34,359; Canaan Fashions, Brooklyn, NY: March 11, 1997.

TA–W–34,388; Georgia-Pacific Corp., Building Products Div., Oriented Strand Board Mill, Woodland, MR: March 18, 1997.

TA–W–34,385; Delphi Automotive Systems, Delphi Interior and Lighting, Brea Operations, Brea, CA: March 17, 1997.

TA–W–34,265; H.H. Cutler Co., Grand Rapids, MI: February 4, 1997.

TA–W–34,378 & A; Newel Co., Acme Frame—a/k/a Intercraft, Mundelein, IL and Waukegan, IL: March 5, 1997.

TA–W–34,352; Wintron, Bellefonte, PA: March 11, 1997.

TA–W–34,412; Hit Apparel, Inc., Athens, TN: March 18, 1997.

TA–W–34,438; A.D.H. Mfg Corp., Farner, TN: March 31, 1997.

TA–W–34,444; Covington Industries, Inc., Opp, Al and Operating at the Following Locations: A; Samson Plant, Samson, AL, B; Florala Plant, Florala, AL, C; Kinston Plant, Kinston, AL, D: Opp Distribution, Opp, AL, E: Opp Sewing, Opp, AL: March 13, 1997.

TA–W–34,448; IBP, Inc., Luverne, MN: March 18, 1997.

TA–W–34,413; Babcock & Wilcox Co., Paris, TX: March 26, 1997.

TA–W–34,259; Cleveland Kniting Mills, Cleveland, OH: February 9,

TA–W–34,395; Henry I. Siegel Co., Inc., Chic by H.I.S. Div., Monticello, KY: March 24, 1997.

TA–W–34,382; Decora Mongomery City, MO: March 12, 1997.

TA–W–34,251; Donna Maria's Sewing, Inc., Ripley, WV: February 4, 1997.

TA–W–34,381; Cannon County Knitting Mills, Smithville, TN: March 13, 1997.

TA–W–34,404; Henry I. Siegel, Chic By H.I.S. Div., Saltillo, TN: March 17, 1997.

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 April, 1998.

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–02231; Spirax Sarco, Inc., Allentown, PA

NAFTA–TAA–02309; Harry G. Kramer, III, Pittsburg, PA

NAFTA–TAA–02247; Streamline Fashions Mfg., Inc., Philipsburg, PA

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

NAFTA–TAA–02282; Georgia-Pacific Corp., Distribution Facility, Eugene, OR

NAFTA–TAA–02338; Johnson Wholesale, Punta Gorda, FL

NAFTA–TAA–02308; Southport Aviation, d/b/a/ Million Air Kansas City, Kansas City, MO

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

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–02322; American Powder Coatings, Inc., El Paso, TX: March 31, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02343; Russell Corp., Milton, FL: March 26, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02188; Donna Maria's Sewing, Inc., Ripley, WV: February 11, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02284; IBP, Inc., Luverne, MN: March 18, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02271; Cannon County Knitting Mills, Smithville, TN: March 13, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02288; Henry I. Siegel Co., Chic By H.I.S. Div., Monticello, KY: March 24, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02273 & A,B,C; Henry I. Siegel Co., Inc., Chic By H.I.S. Div., Saltillo, TN, Gleason, TN, Trezevant, TN and South Fulton, TN: March 17, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02306; Covington Industries, Inc., Opp, AL, and

Operating at the Following Locations: A; Samson Plant, Samson, AL, B; Florala Plant, Florala, AL, C; Kinston Plant, Kinston, AL, D; Opp Distribution Plant, Opp, AL, E; Opp Sewing Plant, Opp, AL: March 13, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02265; Beam Corp., Div. of Deena, Inc., Tolleson, AZ: March 19, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02279; Hit Apparel, Inc., Athens, TN: March 18, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02324; A.D.H. Mfg. Corp., Farner, TN: March 31, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02252; Briggs Industries, Somerset, PA: March 6, 1997.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of April 1998. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–4318, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Connstitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: May 5, 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–13416 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,204]

Pride Companies, L.P., Abilene, Texas; Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked April 14, 1998, one of the petitioners 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 March 20, 1998, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 3, 1998 (63 FR 16574).

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 investigation findings for the March 20 denial of TAA for workers of Pride Companies, L.P., Abilene, Texas producing refined petroleum products showed that criteria (1) and (2) of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act were met; employment, sales and production decreased in January through September 1997 compared with the same time period of the previous year. However, the ''contributed importantly'' requirement of criterion (3) of section 222 was not met. The ''contributed importantly'' test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. A survey conducted by the Department regarding the subject firm's loss of a portion of a competitive bid for military jet fuel in February 1997 revealed that the remainder was awarded to domestic suppliers, with the exception of a very small percentage of the solicitation awarded to a foreign source.

The petitioner asserts that layoffs at the Abilene refinery were the result of increased company purchases of imported products supplied by the Texaco Trading and Transportation Inc. terminal in the Houston ship channel area. The petitioner adds that Texaco Trading and Transportation purchases refined products on the open market from various refineries and distribution terminals.

The investigation findings showed that Pride Companies, L.P. did not purchase any refined petroleum products from Texaco or any foreign sources during the time period relevant to the petition investigation. Information obtained during the investigation shows that Texaco Trading and Transportation Inc. will supply refined petroleum products to Pride, but not until the completion of the conversion of the Abilene refinery to a products and crude oil terminal. Information in Departmental trade adjustment assistance files shows that the primary functions of Texaco Trading and Transportation, Inc. are marketing of domestic crude oil, and transportation of crude oil and products by pipeline and truck.

With respect to the petitioners assertion that U.S. domestic production of refined petroleum is at a maximum and cannot meet demand, U.S. imports of these products declined absolutely and relative to domestic shipment from 1996 to 1997.

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 4th day of May 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–13418 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,199]

Sangamon, Inc., Taylorville, Illinois; Revised Determination on Reconsideration

In response to a letter of March 26, 1998, from the United Paperworkers International Union (UPIU) Local 637, requesting administrative reconsideration of the Department's denial of TAA for workers of the subject firm, the Department reopened its investigation for the former workers of Sangamon, Incorporated.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on March 6, 1998, because the ''contributed importantly'' test of the Group Eligibility Requirements of the Trade Act was not met for workers at the subject firm producing everyday and seasonal greeting cards. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 3, 1998 (63 FR 16,574).

On reconsideration, the Department conducted further survey analysis of the major declining customer of Sangamon, Incorporated. New survey information shows that the major declining customer has indirect import purchases of greeting cards while reducing purchases from the subject firm.

Statistics on greeting cards show aggregate U.S. imports increased in both quantity and value in 1996 and 1997.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the new facts obtained on reopening, it is concluded that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with greeting cards produced by the subject firm contributed importantly to the decline in sales and to the total or partial separation of workers of the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, I