

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