

firm applied a corrosion-resistant zinc coating on cold rolled steel coil substrate produced by the customer. The official further indicates that the closure of the customer facility at the same location as the subject firm is the reason for the closure of the subject plant. The company official further indicated that the sole customer was certified for TAA under TA-W-38,362.

Clarification by the company and review of the initial investigation show that the subject firm was in direct support of a TAA certified facility (TA-W-38,362, LTV Steel Company, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio) that had a majority controlling interest in the subject firm's operation. Since the workers of the subject firm were in direct support of the affiliated TAA certified facility, they meet all eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

### 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 L-S Electro-Galvanizing Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 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 L-S Electro-Galvanizing Company, Cleveland, Ohio, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 3, 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 20th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17144 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,020]

#### Phelps Dodge Hidalgo Inc., Playas, NM; 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 the company on behalf of workers at Phelps Dodge

Hidalgo, Inc., Hidalgo, Playas, New Mexico.

The petition has been deemed invalid. There are three signatures on the petition, but no petitioner information was provided which includes name, address, telephone, and the date of separation. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 28th day of June, 2002.

**Curtis K. Kooser,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17136 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,282, Wilmington, NC, TA-W-39,282A, Leland, NC, TA-W-39,282B, Kinston, NC, TA-W-39,282C, Grifton, NC, TA-W-39,282D, Charleston, SC, TA-W-39,282E, Moncks Corner, SC]

#### Standard Corporation, Integrated Logistics; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated on April 18, 2002, the company 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 applicable to workers of Standard Corporation, Integrated Logistics, Wilmington, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282), Leland, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282A), Kinston, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282B), Grifton, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282C), Charleston, South Carolina (TA-W-39,282D) and Moncks Corner, South Carolina (TA-W-39,282E) was signed on March 5, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2002 (67 FR 13012).

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 TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Standard Corporation, Integrated Logistics, Wilmington, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282), Leland, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282A), Kinston, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282B), Grifton, North Carolina (TA-W-39,282C), Charleston, South Carolina (TA-W-39,282D) and Moncks Corner, South Carolina (TA-W-39,282E) engaged in activities related to providing distribution and warehousing services for an unaffiliated customer that produces polyester fibers. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

In the request for reconsideration, the company indicated that Standard Corporation workers play a vital role in the manufacturing of polyester fibers for Dupont. The petitioner indicated that once the polyester fibers are released from the Dupont Corporation production area, the product is then transported through an in-line conveyor system to the Standard Corporation work area. Standard Corporation associates off-load the polyester fiber and perform the packaging, quality checks, as well as, transport the product to a designated staging area within the Dupont Manufacturing plant.

The new data supplied by the petitioner show that the subject plant workers performed services that are a stage beyond the production performed at the unaffiliated, certified TAA Dupont Corporation, Polyester Enterprise, (Wilmington, North Carolina, TA-W-39,743, Kinston, North Carolina, TA-W-39,743A and Charleston, South Carolina, TA-W-39,743B) plants. Therefore, as indicated in the initial decision, workers do not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, is correct.

### 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 20th day of June, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17141 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P