

**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-05261; *Hein-Werner, Snap-On, Inc., Braboo, WI*

NAFTA-TAA-04822; *ME International, Inc., Duluth, MN*

NAFTA-TAA-05176; *Greenwood Mills, Lindale Manufacturing Co., Lindale, GA*

NAFTA-TAA-05163; *Tyco Electronics, Fiber Optics Div., Glen Rock, PA*

NAFTA-TAA-05053; *Greg Stout Logging, Inc., Gold Hill, OR*

NAFTA-TAA-05201; *AC Enterprises Construction and Fab, Inc., Fargo, ND*

NAFTA-TAA-04761; *Sierra Pine Limited, Springfield Particleboard Div., Springfield, OR*

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

NAFTA-TAA-05340; *Qwest Wireless, Wireless Customer Care Center, Denver, CO*

**Affirmative Determinations NAFTA-TAA**

NAFTA-TAA-05209; *Layne Christensen, Christensen Mining Products, Salt Lake City, UT: August 8, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05193; *Micro Motion, Inc., Boulder, CO: August 7, 2000.*  
NAFTA-TAA-05182; *Sweetwater Walls Industries, Inc., Sweetwater, TX July 24, 2000*

NAFTA-TAA-05205; *Signet Armormite, Inc., San Marcos, CA: July 17, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05056; *Bike Athletic Co., Mountain City, TN: July 9, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-04887; *Siemens Automotive Corp., Safety Electronics Div., Johnson City, TN: May 9, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05100; *International Components Technology Corp., San Jose, CA*

NAFTA-TAA-05263; *VF Imagewear (West), Inc., Harriman, TN: August 22, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-04992; *Teledyne Technologies, Teledyne Relays, Hawthorne, CA: June 4, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05239; *Rundel Products, Inc., Portland, OR: August 22, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05181; *Clifton Walls Industries, Inc., Clifton, TX: July 24, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05138; *Power One, Allston, MA: July 18, 2000.*

NAFTA-TAA-05132; *Gemtron Corp., Clarksville, TN: July 17, 2000.*

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of September and October, 2001. 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: October 12, 2001.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 01-26349 Filed 10-18-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-39,449 and NAFTA-04386]

**Hasbro Manufacturing Services, El Paso, TX; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration**

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at Hasbro Manufacturing Services, El Paso, Texas. The application contained no new substantial information which would bear importantly on the Department's determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued. TA-W-39,449 and NAFTA-04386;

Hasbro Manufacturing Services, El Paso, Texas (October 5, 2001)

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of October, 2001.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 01-26350 Filed 10-18-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-39,069 and NAFTA-04632]

**Rosboro Lumber Company, Mill A, Springfield, OR; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application of May 1, 2001, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's

negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) under petition TA-W-39,069 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) under NAFTA-4632. The denial notices applicable to workers of Rosboro Lumber Company, Mill A, Springfield, Oregon, were signed on April 30, 2001 (TA-W-39,069), and April 19, 2001 (NAFTA-6432) and published in the Federal Register on May 18, 2001 (66 FR 27690) and May 3, 2001 (66 FR 22262), 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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Rosboro Limber Company, Mill A, Springfield, Oregon, producing softwood dimension lumber (primary product produced at the plant), was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed no increased customer imports of softwood dimension lumber during the relevant period. The investigation further revealed that the subject company did not import softwood dimensional lumber during the relevant period.

The NATA-TAA petition for the same worker group was denied because criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) of Section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. A surveys was conducted and revealed that customers did not increase their imports of softwood dimensional lumber from Mexico or Canada during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import softwood dimensional limber from Mexico or Canada, nor was production of softwood dimensional lumber shifted from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioner alleges that the mill produced another product (lam-stock) and that product was being imported by