APPENDIX—Continued

[TAA Petitions instituted between 1/7/08 and 1/11/08]

TA–W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
62647	Honeywell (Union)	Greenville, OH	01/09/08	01/08/08
62648	Trio Manufacturing Company (Comp)	Forsyth, GA	01/09/08	01/08/08
62649	A&R Machine Company, Inc. (Comp)	East Sparta, OH	01/09/08	12/14/07
62650	Crane Vitreous China Plant (Comp)	Hondo, TX	01/09/08	12/13/07
62651	Alcoa (State)	Frederick, MD	01/09/08	01/08/08
62652	The Quill Company, Inc. (Comp)	Cranston, RI	01/09/08	01/07/08
62653	RF Micro Devices (State)	Broomfield, CO	01/09/08	01/07/08
62654	Leggett and Platt/Design Fabricators (Comp)	Thornton, CO	01/09/08	01/04/08
62655	Warp Processing Inc. (Wkrs)	Exeter, PA	01/10/08	01/09/08
62656	Saint Gobain Abrasives (Comp)	Littleton, NH	01/10/08	01/09/08
62657	Plum Creek Evergreen Sawmill and Reman (Comp)	Kalispell, MT	01/10/08	01/09/08
62658	Milwaukee Electric Tool Corporation (Comp)	Jackson, MS	01/10/08	01/09/08
62659	Richloom Home Fashions (Wkrs)	Clinton, SC	01/10/08	01/07/08
62660	Interface Inc. (Wkrs)	Elkin, NC	01/10/08	01/04/08
62661	Agilent Technologies (Comp)	Loveland, CO	01/11/08	01/10/08
62662	Pentair Electronic Packaging (Comp)	Des Plaines, IL	01/11/08	01/09/08
62663	C and D Technologies (Rep)	Conyers, GA	01/11/08	01/09/08
62664	Catawba Valley Finishing, LLC (Wkrs)	Newton, NC	01/11/08	01/10/08
62665	Chemcraft Systems, LLC (Comp)	Cullman, AL	01/11/08	01/10/08
62666	Wentworth Corporation (Comp)	Madison, NC	01/11/08	01/10/08
62667	Gold Toe Moretz, LLC (Comp)	Burlington, NC	01/11/08	01/09/08
62668	Conrad Forest Products (Comp)	North Bend, OR	01/11/08	01/10/08

[FR Doc. E8–1281 Filed 1–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,525]

Magna Donnelly Engineered Glass, Holland, MI; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on December 3, 2007 in response to a worker petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Magna Donnelly Engineered Glass, Holland, Michigan.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 17th day of January 2008.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–1287 Filed 1–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,271]

Ravenswood Specialty Services, Inc., Ravenswood, WV; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated November 29, 2007, the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (the Union) requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of Ravenswood Specialty Services, Inc., Ravenswood, West Virginia (subject firm) to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The negative determination was issued on October 18, 2007. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 31, 2007 (72 FR 61686). Workers produce nylon polymer and Minlon, and are not separately identifiable by related article.

The petition was denied because the subject firm did not shift production to a foreign country, the subject firm did not import nylon polymer or Minlon, and the subject firm's major declining customer did not import nylon polymer or Minlon during the relevant period.

In the request for reconsideration, the Union stated that ''the workers' separations are due to foreign imports and a shift of production to a foreign country. We are in the process of gathering further information to help support this position and will forward it to your office as soon as possible.''

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c), administrative 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 Union did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that