

NAFTA-TAA-06205; ZF-Meritor, LLC, Meritor Clutch Co., Maxton, NC  
 NAFTA-TAA-05955; Swanson Erie Corp., Assembly Systems, Erie, PA  
 NAFTA-TAA-05981; Truman Logging, Inc., Rexford, MT  
 NAFTA-TAA-05853; Tri-Way Manufacturing, Inc., El Paso, TX  
 NAFTA-TAA-05835; Pabst Brewing Co., Lehigh Valley Plant, Fogelsville, PA  
 NAFTA-TAA-05949; Schaeff, Inc., A Subsidiary of Terex, Sioux City, IA  
 NAFTA-TAA-06196; Bemis Manufacturing Co., Crandon Div., Crandon, WI  
 NAFTA-TAA-05974; Quality Components, Inc., Klamath Falls, OR

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

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

NAFTA-TAA-05783; Maska U.S., Inc., A Subsidiary of The Hockey Co., Williston, VT

NAFTA-TAA-05764; J. Dashew, Inc., Baltimore, MD

#### **Affirmative Determinations NAFTA-TAA**

NAFTA-TAA-06187; Honeywell International Garrett Engine Boosting (Formerly Doing Business as Allied Signal), Garrett Engine Boosting Systems, Torrance, CA: April 14, 2002.

NAFTA-TAA-06113; Crossroad Knitting, Inc., Claudville, VA: April 15, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-06107; Modine Manufacturing Co., Emporia Facility, Emporia, KS: January 16, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-06102 & A; Harris Welco, Plastics Departmentm Kings Mountain, NC and Personnel Services Unlimited, Kings Mountain, NC (Employed in the Plastics Department, Harris Welco, Kings Mountain, NC): April 22, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-06063; Celestica, Inc., Westminster, CO: March 29, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-05978; Fourply, Inc., Plywood Div., Grans Pass, OR: March 8, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-5964; Levolor Kirsch Window Fashions, Newell Rubbermaid Div., Shamokin, PA: March 12, 2001.

NAFTA-TAA-05914; Cedar Hill Manufacturing, Inc., Ansonville, NC: February 15, 2001.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were

issued during the month of June, 2002. 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: July 3, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17138 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

### **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-41,024]

#### **Whisper Jet Inc., Sanford, FL; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 11, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Whisper Jet, Inc., Sanford, Florida.

The petitioner submitting the petition has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 26th day of June, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17137 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

### **Employment and Training Administration**

[NAFTA-05773]

#### **Superior Milling, Inc., Watersmeet, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 29, 2002, the employees requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 18, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22115).

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 denial of NAFTA-TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of rough green lumber at Superior Milling, Inc, Watersmeet, Michigan 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, as amended, were not met. There were no increased company imports of rough green lumber from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from the subject plant to Mexico or Canada. A survey of customers conducted by the Department of Labor revealed that customers did not increase their import purchase of products like or directly competitive with those produced at the Watersmeet plant from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that some customers of the subject plant imported rough green lumber during the relevant period. The petitioner also specifies which customers they believe are importing rough green lumber and thus impacting the subject plant.

A review of the initial investigation and the corresponding survey results conducted during the investigation shows that the company supplied a customer list that accounted for greater than 85% of the subject plant's sales for the years 2000 and 2001. Extrapolating the provided customer list sales from subject plant sales shows that the unreported customers as a group increased their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

During the initial investigation the Department of Labor surveyed the reported declining customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of rough green lumber during the relevant period (2000 and 2001). The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their imports of rough green lumber from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner further alleges that a major customer imported a sizeable amount of flooring stock from Canada and believes that those imports