TA–W–62,990; Airline Manufacturing Co., Inc., Columbus, MS: March 4, 2001

TA–W–63,026; Pioneer Manufacturing Company, Inc., Colorado Springs, CO: March 18, 2007

TA–W–63,037; Webb Furniture Enterprises, Inc., American Mirror Division, Leased Wkrs from Manpower, Galax, VA: March 14, 2007

TA–W–63,090; Bright Wood Corporation, Bend, OR: March 27, 2007

The following certifications have been issued. The requirements of Section 222(b) (downstream producer for a firm whose workers are certified eligible to apply for TAA based on increased imports from or a shift in production to Mexico or Canada) and Section 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Trade Act have been met.

None.

Negative Determinations for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In the following cases, it has been determined that the requirements of 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) have not been met for the reasons specified.

The Department has determined that criterion (1) of Section 246 has not been met. The firm does not have a significant number of workers 50 years of age or older.

None.

The Department has determined that criterion (2) of Section 246 has not been met. Workers at the firm possess skills that are easily transferable.

TA–W–63,071; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Marlborough, MA.

TA–W–63,071A; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Dallas, OR.

TA–W–63,071B; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Portland, OR.

TA–W–63,071C; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Sebastopol, CA.

TA–W–63,071D; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Corona, CA.

TA–W–63,071E; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Saratoga, CA.

TA–W–63,071F; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Canton, TX.

TA–W–63,071G; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Gardner, MA.

TA–W–63,071H; Rohm and Haas Company, Electronic Materials Division, Lock Haven, PA.

TA–W–63,039; Yanni's Design, Development and Supplies, Inc., Appleton, WI.

The Department has determined that criterion (3) of Section 246 has not been met. Competition conditions within the workers' industry are not adverse.

None.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the eligibility criteria for worker adjustment assistance have not been met for the reasons specified.

Because the workers of the firm are not eligible to apply for TAA, the workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.A.) and (a)(2)(B)(II.A.) (employment decline) have not been met.

TA–W–63,017; Quantum Corporation, Irvine, CA.

TA–W–63,159; Ametek, Inc., Floorcare and Specialty Motors Division, Kent, OH.

TA–W–63,170; General Electric Company, Consumer and Electrical Division, Plainville, CT.

TA–W–63,234; Consoltex International, Inc., New York Sales Office, New York, NY.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.B.) (Sales or production, or both, did not decline) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

None.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.C.) (increased imports) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

TA–W–62,862; Liz Claiborne, Inc., Dana Buchman Division, Sample Room, New York, NY.

TA–W–62,899; Profilia Corporation, City of Commerce, CA.

TA–W–63,109; Evergy, Inc., A Subsidiary of Tecumseh Products Co., Paris, TN.

The workers' firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–62,646; Pfizer Global Manufacturing—Unit 40749, Pfizer Global Manufacturing Division, Portage, MI.

TA–W–63,060; KB Pacific LLC, dba Keith Brown Building Materials, Madras, OR.

TA–W–63,082; Nortel, Software Data and Configuration Services, Research Triangle Park, NC.

TA–W–63,195; Roadway Express, A Subsidiary of YRC Worldwire, Rockingham, NC.

TA–W–63,198; Dakota Imaging, LLC, A Division of Emdeon Business Services, LLC, El Paso, TX.

The investigation revealed that criteria of Section 222(b)(2) has not been met. The workers' firm (or subdivision) is not a supplier to or a downstream producer for a firm whose workers were certified eligible to apply for TAA.

None.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the period of April 21 through April 25, 2008. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: May 5, 2008.

Erin Fitzgerald,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–10584 Filed 5–12–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,821]

Ameridrives International, Llc, Erie, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated April 3, 2008, petitioners 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) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The denial notice was signed on March 11, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2008 (73 FR 16064).

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, which was filed on behalf of workers at Ameridrives International, LLC, Erie, Pennsylvania engaged in the production of industrial couplings, was denied based on the findings that during the relevant time period, sales and production of industrial couplings at the subject firm did not decrease and no shift in production to a foreign country occurred.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioners provided the same reasons, as in the initial petition, why workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA. In particular, the petitioners alleged that a 202.5 Spacer (Part# 079507–001) ''at one time was machined complete at Ameridrives and is now being manufactured at Great Taiwan Gear in Taiwan.''

The company official was contacted to address this allegation. The official indicated that production of 202.5 Spacer (Part# 079507–001) ceased at the subject firm in 2005.

When assessing eligibility for TAA, the Department exclusively considers production during the relevant time period (one year prior to the date of the petition). Therefore, events occurring in 2005 are outside of the relevant time period and are not relevant in this investigation.

The petitioners also stated that ''large universal joint components such as yokes, crosses and roller bearings are now all purchased from China''.

The company official stated that yokes, crosses and roller bearings are ''raw state materials'' used in the production of industrial couplings. The official also stated that since 1999 manufacturing of these parts have been outsourced to other companies as they were no longer produced at the subject firm.

The petitioners attached two documents showing Ameridrives foreign sister facilities, where ''products formerly made in Erie could be possibly now be manufactured.''

According to the company official, none of the Ameridrives foreign facilities manufacture like or directly competitive products with industrial couplings manufactured by the subject facility in Erie, Pennsylvania.

The petitioner 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 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 7th day of May, 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–10591 Filed 5–12–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,661]

Agilent Technologies, Measurement Systems Division, Loveland, CO; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 17, 2008, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 25, 2008 (73 FR 22433–22434).

The previous investigation was initiated on January 11, 2008 and resulted in a negative determination issued on March 13, 2008. The finding revealed that the worker separations at the subject firm were attributed to a shift in production of automated X-ray inspection system prototypes (including software code and hardware design functions) to Malaysia, a country that is not a party to a free trade agreement nor a beneficiary country with the United States. The subject firm did not import automated X-ray inspection system prototypes (including software code and hardware design functions) following the shift in production to a foreign source. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 29, 2008 (73 FR 11153).

The request for reconsideration alleges that Agilent Technologies may be in fact an importer of X-ray inspection systems and software.

Upon further contact with company official, it was revealed that the subject firm manufactured only software products during the relevant period. Based on new information it has been determined that the subject firm workers were impacted by a shift in production of software to Malaysia during the relevant period. The investigation also revealed that the firm recently increased their imports of software from Malaysia.

In accordance with Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I determine that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm or subdivision to Malaysia of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or subdivision, and there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of like or directly competitive articles. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

''All workers of Agilent Technologies, Measurement Systems Division, Loveland, Colorado, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 10, 2007, 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, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.''

Signed in Washington, DC, this 6th day of May 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8–10589 Filed 5–12–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P