

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, filed on behalf of workers at Fujitsu Network Communications (FNC), Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina were engaged in activities related to software programming and computer support. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner attempts to demonstrate that the subject plant workers produced a specific article. The petitioner indicates that the product is called "NETSMART" which is an operating system with a graphical user interface. The petitioner further indicates that most of the workers were software developers and some were assigned computer tasks that involved leasing of the developers computers, upgrading the developer's computers with the latest versions of third party software, and regularly developing code into a single functioning unit to be burned on to a compact disk for distribution.

The functions of programming, technical support and the other administrative functions depicted by the petitioner are not considered production activities. A review of the initial investigation shows no production of an article was ever performed at the subject facility during the relevant period.

The workers at the subject firm do not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act 1974.

### 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 1st day of August, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-20199 Filed 8-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,004]

#### Glen Raven, Inc., Burnsville, NC; 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 worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Glen Raven, Inc., Burnsville, North Carolina.

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 at Washington, DC this 2nd day of August 2002.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-20196 Filed 8-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

Signed at Washington, DC this 5th day of August, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-20194 Filed 8-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-41,173]

#### Progress Lighting, Philadelphia, PA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 25, 2002, in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Progress Lighting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

An active certification covering the petitioning group of workers is already in effect (TA-W-38,307A, as amended). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 25th day of July, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-20197 Filed 8-8-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,548 and TA-W-40,458A]

#### Handler Textile, a Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Stone Mountain, GA; and Duro Industries Sales Corporation, A Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Rochester, NY; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at Handler Textile, a Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia and Duro Industries Sales Corporation, a Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Rochester, New York. The application contained no new substantial information which would bear importantly on the Department's determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-40,458; Handler Textile, a Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia and

TA-W-40,458A; Duro Industries Sales Corporation, a Division of Duro Industries, Inc., Rochester, New York (July 30, 2002)

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,099]

#### Shasta Paper Company, Shasta Acquisition, Plainwell Paper, Anderson, CA; 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 January 17, 2002, applicable to workers of Shasta Paper Company, Anderson, California. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4750).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of coated and uncoated printing paper.

New information shows that Shasta Acquisition is the parent firm of Shasta Paper Company and Plainwell Paper.