employment related to the production of metal stamping for the automobile industry, 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 that none of the respondents imported products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced during the relevant period.

The NAFTA–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. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their imports of products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import from Canada or Mexico products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced, nor was the subject plant's production shifted from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada.

The petitioner alleges that the Dodge pickup inner box panel jobs that left the plant in mid 2001 went to the Chrysler plant in Saltillo, Mexico.

Review of the initial investigation and data supplied by the respondents during the corresponding survey indicate that the customer of the Dodge pickup inner box panel ceased purchasing the product from the subject firm during July 2001, in favor of purchasing the product from other domestic sources.

Further review of the findings in the initial decision, indicate that the company did not shift production of Dodge pickup inner box panels to Mexico or Canada, nor did they import the panels from Mexico or Canada 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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–13539 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–39,967]

Bethlehem Steel Corp., Lackawanna Coke Division, Lackawanna, NY; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of January 23, 2002, the United Steel Workers of America, AFL–CIO–CLC, 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). The denial notice was signed on December 11, 2001 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 26, 2001 (66 FR 66426).

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 Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Lackawanna Coke Division, New York engaged in the production of blast furnace coke, 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 Department conducted a survey of the subject company's major customers regarding their purchases of blast furnace coke. The survey revealed that none of the customers purchased imported blast furnace coke during the relevant period. United States aggregate imports of coke and semicoke declined in the January through September 2001 period over the corresponding January through September 2000 period. The investigation further revealed that although Bethlehem Steel Corporation imports blast furnace coke, these imports had no effect on the Lackawanna plant because they went to facilities never supplied by the Lackawanna plant.

The petitioner alleges that increased imports of steel had a direct effect on coke consumption, thus impacting the Lackawanna coke plant. The petitioner further states that ''the long term trends of higher coke and steel imports resulted in the shutdown of Lackawanna.''

Steel imports into the United States is not relevant to the TAA investigation that was filed on behalf of workers producing blast furnace coke. The product imported must be ''like or directly'' competitive with what the subject firm plant produced and the imports must ''contribute importantly'' to the layoffs at the subject plant to meet the eligibility requirements for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974. Further examination of the facts developed in the initial investigation show that company imports, customer imports and aggregate U.S. imports of blast furnace coke 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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of April, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–13540 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–40,449]

Clebert's Hosiery Mill, Inc., Connelly Springs, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of March 29, 2002, the company requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on February 15, 2002, based on the finding that imports of socks did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the Connelly Springs plant. The denial

notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 28, 2002 (67 FR 9324).

The company requested that the Department examine industry data concerning the amount of sock imports entering the United States.

A review of relevant industry data, not available during the initial investigation, shows that sock imports increased significantly in the 2001 period indicating an increased reliance on imported socks during the 2001 period.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Clebert's Hosiery Mill, Inc., Connelly Springs, North Carolina, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Clebert's Hosiery Mill, Inc., Connelly Springs, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 7, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 9th day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–13545 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–40,328]

Drexel Heritage Furnishings, Inc., Machine Shop, Morganton, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of February 21, 2002, the petitioners, requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on January 22, 2002, based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant. The declines in employment at the subject plant were attributed to the outsourcing of products produced by the subject plant (saw blades, shaper knives and other cutting bits) used in the manufacturing of furniture. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 5, 2002 (67 FR 5293).

The petitioners allege that the importing of furniture by an affiliate, Drexel Heritage Furnishings at Morganton, North Carolina, in which they were in direct support of drastically reduced the production of furniture and thus impacted the subject plant.

Information provided by the petitioner and information provided by the company show that the subject plant workers were in direct support, producing saw blades, shaper knives and other cutting bits for of an affiliated plant(s) (Drexel Heritage Furnishings Inc., Plant #3 and #5, Morganton, North Carolina). The workers of Drexel Heritage Furnishings Inc., Plants #3 and #5 produced residential furniture and were certified eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance on June 4, 2001 under TA-W–39,275. Therefore, since the workers of Drexel Heritage Furnishings, Inc., Machine Shop, North Carolina were in direct support (meaningful portion) of the residential furniture produced at the certified affiliated facilities, they meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Drexel Heritage Furnishings, Inc., Morganton, North Carolina, in which the subject firm was in direct support, contributed importantly to the declines in the firm's sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the Drexel Heritage Furnishings, Inc., Machine Shop, Morganton, North Carolina. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Drexel Heritage Furnishings, Inc., Machine Shop, Morganton, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 9, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 6th day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–13543 Filed 5–29–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–39,522]

JLG Industries Inc., Bedford, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application post marked March 1, 2002, a worker 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 January 14, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4749).

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 petition for the workers of JLG Industries Inc., Bedford, Pennsylvania 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 customers of the workers' firm. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imported scissor lift aerial work platforms, while decreasing their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period. The investigation further revealed that the company did not import products like or directly competitive with scissor lift aerial work platforms produced at the subject firm during the relevant period.

The petitioner requested that the Department of Labor examine the facts pertaining to the company opening up