

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

[TA-W-40,779]

**Bulk Lift International, Carpentersville, IL; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on February 11, 2002 in response to a worker petition, which was filed, by the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Workers, Chicago and Central States Joint Board on behalf of workers at Bulk Lift International, Carpentersville, Illinois.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn.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. 02-17134 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

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

[TA-W-40,320]

**Elk Rapids Engineering, a Division of Star Cutter Company, Elk Rapids, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 16, 2002, a petitioner 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 May 7, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35140).

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 petition for the workers of Elk Rapids Engineering, Elk Rapids, Michigan 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 CNC controlled machine tools while decreasing their purchases from the subject firm. The subject firm did not import CNC controlled machine tools.

The petitioner believes that their company as well as the entire machine tool industry in the United States has been significantly affected by increased imports of machine tools. The petitioner attempts to support this claim by providing a transcript of testimony given by the Association for Manufacturing Technology before the Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives on April 24, 2002. The petitioner also indicates that customers are spending less and importing more machine tools during the relevant period. The petitioner further attached a summary of U.S. Machine-Tool Orders depicting significant declines in orders during the last few years.

A review of the data supplied by the petitioner depicts industry wide data that is not specific to the products produced at the subject plant. The Department of Labor examines the direct impact of imports that are "like or directly competitive" with what the subject plant produced and if imports "contributed importantly" to the layoffs at the subject plant. The investigation revealed that imports of the product produced at the subject plant did not "contribute importantly" to the layoffs at the subject plant. The U.S. Machine-Tool Order data supplied by the petitioner depicts declines in U.S. machine-tool orders during the last few years. U.S. machine tool orders include those for the export market, as well as the domestic market. Thus a reduced demand for U.S. machine tools (depicted by orders) does not reflect a definitive increase in imports. Examination of industry data in which the subject firm's products are categorized shows that U.S. imports of products like or directly competitive with what the subject firm produced declined in 2001 over 2000.

**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. 02-17143 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

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

[TA-W-40,309]

**Firestone Tube Co., a Division of Bridgestone/Firestone North American Tire, LLC, Subsidiary of Bridgestone Corp., Russellville, AR; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 14, 2002, the United Steelworkers of America, Local 884 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 April 18, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22114).

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 petition for the workers of Firestone Tube Company, a division of Bridgestone/Firestone North American Tire, LLC, a subsidiary of Bridgestone Corp., Russellville, Arkansas was denied because criterion (2) was not met. Sales and production at the subject firm increased during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that plant production declined during the relevant

period and attempts to illustrate these declines in production by supplying plant statistics of cure sets (molds used in the production of tubes) to attempt to show that production of tubes at the subject plant declined during the relevant period.

A review of the initial decision shows that plant sales and production increased from January through September 2001 over the corresponding 2000 period. During the initial investigation the company reported declines in plant sales and production in the year 2000 over the 1999 period. However, due to the reported decline in sales and production during the year 2000, although not noted in the TAA decision, the U.S. Department of Labor conducted a survey of the major declining customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of automobile inner tubes for the 1999, 2000 and the January through November 2001 period over the corresponding 2000 period. The survey is conducted to test if customer imports of like or directly competitive products as produced at the subject firm "contributed importantly" to the worker separations of the workers' firm. None of the customers reported importing inner tubes during the relevant period.

The United Steel Workers of America, Local 884 further alleges that the company is importing tubes from Korea and China to the Russellville, Arkansas plant and then sells the tubes to customers.

Further review of company data supplied during the initial investigation, shows that the company imported a grouping of small tubes, most of which the plant was unable to produce. The reported imports of these tubes were relatively stable during the relevant period. The amount of company tube imports like or directly competitive with what the subject firm produced was also relatively low, therefore imports like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced did not contribute importantly to the layoffs at the subject firm.

### 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. 02-17142 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,774]

#### Frederic Goldman, Inc., Casting Division, New York, NY; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on February 11, 2002, in response to a worker petition, which was filed by the company on behalf of workers at Frederic Goldman, Inc., Casting Division, New York, New York.

The petitioner 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 21st day of June, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17145 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,434]

#### Notice of Termination of Investigation; Goodrich Corp., Spencer, WV

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on April 29, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Goodrich Corporation, Spencer, West Virginia.

The petitioner 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 18th day of June, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-17148 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,878]

#### JTD, Inc., Tigard, OR; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 4, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at JTD, Incorporated, Tigard, Oregon.

The company official 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. 02-17135 Filed 7-8-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,529]

#### L-S Electro-Galvanizing Co., Cleveland, OH; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of May 23, 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 April 22, 2002 based on the finding that imports of corrosion-resistant zinc coated cold rolled steel coils did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the Cleveland plant. The denial notice was published in the *Federal Register* on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22112).

To support the request for reconsideration, the company official provided clarification concerning the relationship between the subject firm and their sole customer. The company official indicated that their sole customer was a majority owner (Joint Venture) of L-S Electro-Galvanizing Company (LSE), Cleveland, Ohio and that the subject firm was in direct support of that operation. The subject