

Division of Unova, Warren, Michigan. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2002 (67 FR 13013).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information shows that worker separations occurred at the Lake Orion, Michigan location of the subject firm when it closed in February, 2002. The Lake Orion, Michigan workers were engaged in the production of automated metal removal equipment, transfer lines and dial transfers.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to include workers of Lamb Technicon, A Division of Unova, Lake Orion, Michigan.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Lamb Technicon who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-40,267 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Lamb Technicon, a Division of Unova, Warren, Michigan (TA-W-40,267) and Lake Orion, Michigan (TA-W-40,267A) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 12, 2000, through March 1, 2004, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 3rd day of July, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18069 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,947]

#### **Martin Marietta Magnesia Specialties, Inc., Manistee, MI; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By letter of May 3, 2002, the company 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 March 27, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on April 5, 2002 (67 FR 16441).

Based on additional information provided by the company, the Department of Labor will conduct a survey of an additional major customer

of the subject firm regarding their purchases of magnesium oxide during the relevant period.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC this 17th day of June, 2002

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18068 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,783]

#### **Plasticsource, Inc., Kelly Staff Leasing, Kelly Services, Inc., El Paso, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the U.S. Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on September 28, 2001, applicable to workers of PlasticSource, Inc. located in El Paso, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on October 19, 2001 (66 FR 53251).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information provided by the State shows that temporary workers of Kelly Services, Inc. were employed at PlasticSource, Inc. to produce automotive headlamp parts and vacuum cleaner parts at the El Paso, Texas location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending the certification to include temporary workers of Kelly Services, Inc. employed at PlasticSource, Inc., El Paso, Texas.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of PlasticSource, Inc. who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-39,783 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of PlasticSource, El Paso, Texas, and workers of Kelly Staff Leasing and Kelly Services, Inc. producing headlamp parts and vacuum cleaner parts at Plastic

Source, El Paso, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after July 26, 2000, through September 28, 2003, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

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

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18065 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,137]

#### **Weitech, Inc., Including Temporary Workers of Labor Ready, Sisters, OR; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on August 24, 2001, applicable to workers of Weitech, Inc., Sisters, Oregon. The notice will be published soon in the **Federal Register**.

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information provided by the company shows that temporary workers of Labor Ready were employed at Weitech, Inc. to produce electronic pest repellers at the Sisters, Oregon location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending the certification to include temporary workers of Labor Ready employed at Weitech, Inc., Sisters, Oregon.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Weitech, Inc. adversely affected by imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-39,137 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Weitech, Inc., Sisters, Oregon including temporary workers of Labor Ready, Sisters, Oregon engaged in employment related to the production of electronic pest repellers at Weitech, Inc., Sisters, Oregon who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after April 5, 2000, through August 24, 2003, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 3rd day of July, 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18064 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-5480]

#### **AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 22, 2002, the company 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 26, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35144).

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 denial of NAFTA-TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of tools, dies, specialty tooling and injection molds at AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, Pennsylvania 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 tools, dies, specialty tooling and injection molds from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from AA Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, Pennsylvania to Mexico or Canada. The survey conducted by the Department of Labor revealed that customers did not purchase products like or directly competitive with those produced at the Meadville plant from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that a customer of the subject plant is relocating to China and other countries in Southeastern Asia.

The shift in production to China and other countries by the customer is not a relevant factor in meeting the eligibility requirement of section 250 of the Trade Act.

The company further states that several companies (did not identify companies) located in the proximity of the subject firm have been certified for NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA) that sold similar products to the same customer as the subject firm.

The alleged NAFTA certifications of companies in the proximity of the subject firm may have been made for different reasons, such as a different product line, other customer(s) increasing their imports from Canada or Mexico or a shift in plant production to Canada or Mexico. Further review of the customer survey conducted by the Department of Labor during the initial investigation shows that the customer at issue did not report importing products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced from Canada or Mexico 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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18079 Filed 7-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA-5918]

#### **Britax Heath Techna, Inc. Aircraft Interior Systems, Bellingham, WA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated May 23, 2002, the petitioners 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 22, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22113).

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 retrofitting various commercial aircraft interior components and services at Britax Heath Techna, Inc., Aircraft Interior Systems, Bellingham, Washington, was denied based on the workers not producing an article as required for certification under section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The petitioner alleges that the company was engaged in the production of a product. The petitioner indicated that the subject firm in combination of retrofitting aerospace interior components, also produced (OEM) Original Engineered Manufacturing Aerospace components. The petitioner further alleges that firm sales declined due to a decline in orders from foreign customers and a major U.S. aircraft manufacturer.

The Department of Labor upon further review of the initial decision and further contact with the company concurs with the petitioner that a portion of the work performed by the workers at the subject plant consisted of activities related to the production of a product (OEM Aerospace components).

A review of company data supplied during initial investigation and further contact with the company shows that there were no company imports of OEM Aerospace components from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from Bellingham, Washington to Mexico or Canada.

Further review of data supplied during the initial investigation, in conjunction with data recently supplied by the company, show that the subject firm's customers are located worldwide, with the overwhelming majority of sales directed towards foreign customers. Based on information provided by the company, a significant portion of the