

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination, based on the finding that imports of light duty diesel engines did not contribute to worker separations at the subject facility and there was no shift in production from the subject firm to foreign country during the period under investigation.

The petitioner stated that General Motors is “getting out of the light truck business” and that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA due to the changes in the program.

The investigation revealed that workers of DMAX Ltd., LLC, Dayton, Ohio produced light duty diesel engines. The investigation also revealed that worker separations at the subject facility were not caused by increased imports of light duty diesel engines into the United States nor by a shift in production of light duty diesel engines from the subject facility to a foreign country. DMAX, Ltd., LLC did not import light duty diesel engines and did not shift production abroad. The Department surveyed subject firm’s major customer regarding its purchases of light duty diesel engines in 2007, 2008, January through May 2008 and January through May 2009. The survey revealed no imports during the relevant period.

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 in Washington, DC, this 2nd day of December, 2009.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9-29500 Filed 12-10-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-70,406]

### Greenville Metals, Inc., Powder Division, Transfer, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On October 20, 2009, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on November 5, 2009 (74 FR 57333).

The initial investigation initiated on May 22, 2009, resulted in a negative determination issued on September 28, 2009, was based on the finding that imports of powdered metals did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift in production to a foreign source occurred. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on November 17, 2009 (74 FR 59255).

On reconsideration, the Department requested additional information from the subject firm’s largest customer to determine whether imports of powdered metals negatively impacted employment at the subject firm.

The survey of the major declining customer revealed that the customer directly incorporated powdered metals purchased from the subject firm into powdered core. The investigation further revealed that the largest customer shifted purchases of powdered metals from the subject firm to sources in South East Asia in September 2008. Furthermore, this customer increased its imports of powdered core containing foreign-manufactured powdered metals during the relevant period and this increase in imports contributed importantly to the workers’ separation at Greenville Metals, Inc., Powder Division, Transfer, Pennsylvania.

The investigation also revealed that sales, production and employment at the subject firm declined during the relevant period.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Greenville Metals, Inc., Powder Division, Transfer, Pennsylvania, who are engaged in activities related to the production of powdered metals meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of Greenville Metals, Inc., Powder Division, Transfer, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 19, 2008, through two years from the date of this certification, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on date of certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 24th day of November 2009.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9-29512 Filed 12-10-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (09-107)]

### Government-Owned Inventions, Available for Licensing

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of Inventions for Licensing.

**SUMMARY:** Patent applications on the inventions listed below assigned to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have been filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and are available for licensing.

**DATES:** December 11, 2009.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark W. Homer, Patent Counsel, NASA Management Office—JPL, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Mail Stop 180-200, Pasadena, CA 91109; telephone (818) 354-7770.

NASA Case No.: NPO-45948-1: Monolithic Afocal Telescope;

NASA Case No.: NPO-45911-1: Method to Improve Indium Bump bonding Via Indium Oxide Removal Using a Multi-Step Plasma Process;

NASA Case No.: NPO-46843-1: Metal Patch Antenna;