

Company, Commercial Aircraft Group. The Department has determined that these workers were sufficiently under the control of the subject firm to be considered leased workers.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending the certification to include workers leased from Comforce Corporation, Adecco, Multax, Inconen, CTS, Hi-Tec, Woods, Ciber, Kelly Services, Analysts International Corp, Comsys, Filter LLC, Excell, Entegeee, Chipton-Ross, Ian Martin, Can-Tech, IT Services, IDEX Solutions (NW CAD), Media Logic, HL YOH, Volt, PDS, CDI Corp, Teksystems, Innovative Systems, Inc., and Murphy & Associates working on-site at both the Puget Sound, Washington and Portland, Oregon locations of The Boeing Company, Commercial Aircraft Group.

The amended notice applicable to the TA-W-70,520 and TA-W 70,520A is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of The Boeing Company, Commercial Aircraft Group, including on-site leased workers from Comforce Corporation, Adecco, Multax, Inconen, CTS, Hi-Tec, Woods, Ciber, Kelly Services, Analysts International Corp, Comsys, Filter LLC, Excell, Entegeee, Chipton-Ross, Ian Martin, Can-Tech, IT Services, IDEX Solutions (NW CAD), Media Logic, HL YOH, Volt, PDS, CDI Corp, Teksystems, Innovative Systems, Inc., and Murphy & Associates, Puget Sound, Washington (TA-W-70,520), and Portland, Oregon (TA-W-70,520A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 22, 2008, through October 19, 2011, 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 8th day of January 2010.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-899 Filed 1-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-71,447]

Applied Materials, Inc., Including On-Site Leased Workers From Adecco Employment Services, Aerotek, Inc., CDI IT Solutions (CDI Corporation), D&Z Microelectronics, Pentagon Technology, Proactive Business Solution, Inc., Technical Resources, SQA Services and NSTAR, Austin, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Act"), 19 U.S.C. 2273, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on September 30, 2009, applicable to workers of Applied Materials, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adecco Employment Services, Aerotek, Inc., CDI IT Solutions, D&Z Microelectronics, Pentagon Technology, Proactive Business Solution, Inc., Technical Resources, SQA Services and NSTAR, Austin, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on November 17, 2009 (74 FR 59253).

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 semiconductor equipment.

Information shows that on-site leased workers from CDI IT Solutions had their wages reported under a separated unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for its parent firm, CDI Corporation.

Accordingly, the Department is amending this certification to properly reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of the subject firm who were adversely affected by the shift in production of semiconductor equipment to Singapore.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-71,447 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Applied Materials, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adecco Employment Services, Aerotek, Inc., CDI IT Solutions (CDI Corporation), D&Z Microelectronics, Pentagon Technology, Proactive Business Solution, Inc., Technical Resources, SQA Services, and NSTAR, Austin, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 25, 2008 through September 30, 2011, 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 at Washington, DC this 15th day of December 2009.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-900 Filed 1-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-71,903]

JP Morgan Chase and Company; JP Morgan Investment Banking, Global Corporate Financial Operations, New York, NY; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated October 12, 2009, a petitioner 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 JP Morgan Chase and Company, JP Morgan Investment Banking, Global Corporate Financial Operations, New York, New York. The Department's Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration was signed on October 27, 2009, and published in the **Federal Register** on November 12, 2009 (74 FR 58315).

The investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that workers' separations or threat of separations were not related to an increase in imports or shift/acquisition of business research and clerical support operations to/from a foreign country. The subject firm did not import services like or directly competitive with services provided by workers of the subject firm and did not shift provision of these services abroad.

In the request for reconsideration the petitioner alleged that workers worked for JP Morgan Chase and Company, Global Corporate Financial Operations (GCFO), Presentation Production Services (PPS). The petitioner further alleged that JP Morgan operates facilities in Mumbai and Bangalore and that JP Morgan shifted provision of services from the subject firm to India. Specifically, the petitioner alleged that the bankers of JP Morgan were instructed to bypass the PPS offices in the United States and send work directly to JP Morgan facilities abroad.

The Department contacted company officials of JP Morgan Chase to address the above allegations. The company officials confirmed that JP Morgan Chase has subsidiaries in India and Argentina which provide additional support services to bankers of JP Morgan Chase. The company officials further stated that bankers were not instructed to bypass PPS but utilize centers in Argentina and India as an option if the local service was not available. The officials confirmed that JP Morgan Chase did not shift provision of services from the subject firm to a foreign location.

The Department requested employment information for the foreign facilities of JP Morgan Chase that perform services like or directly competitive with services provided by workers of the subject firm. The data revealed that employment at these facilities declined in 2008 and 2009.

The investigation revealed that the reduction in business volume caused the subject firm's reorganization and that the layoffs at the subject facility was not related to increased imports of business research, clerical support operations or presentation production services and there was no shift of these services abroad during the period under investigation.

The petitioner further alleged that workers of the subject firm provided services to bankers of JP Morgan Chase, who in turn, provided services to external clients.

The company official verified that PPS is an internal service provider only and that the workers of the subject firm did not provide services directly to external clients and vendors.

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 reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of JP Morgan Chase and Company, JP Morgan Investment Banking, Global Corporate Financial Operation, New York, New York.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of January 2010.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-893 Filed 1-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-70,326]

Ford Motor Company, Dearborn Truck Plant, Dearborn, MI; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated September 18, 2009, a petitioner 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 Ford Motor Company, Dearborn Truck Plant, Dearborn, Michigan. The Department's Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration was signed on September 29, 2009, and published in the **Federal Register** on October 20, 2009 (74 FR 53766).

The investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that workers' separations or threat of separations were not related to an increase in imports of like or directly competitive products with Ford F Series pickups and Lincoln Mark LR sports-utility pickups and there was no shift/acquisition of production of Ford F Series pickups and Lincoln Mark LR sports-utility pickups to/from a foreign country.

The petitioners alleged that production at the subject facility was negatively impacted by increased imports of directly competitive products. The petition further states that "any brand of new vehicle available for purchase" should be considered like or directly competitive with the products manufactured by the subject firm, thus imports of all vehicles should be considered in the investigation.

In order to establish import impact, the Department solicits relevant information from the subject firm, customers of the subject firm and analyzes available United States aggregate data regarding imports of articles, including articles like or directly competitive with the products manufactured by the subject firm for the relevant period (one year prior to the date of the petition). Like or directly competitive means that like articles are

those which are substantially identical in inherent or intrinsic characteristics; and directly competitive articles are those which, although not substantially identical, are substantially equivalent for commercial purposes (i.e., adapted to the same uses and essentially interchangeable therefore).

In case at hand, the like articles are specifically Ford F Series pickups and Lincoln Mark LT sports-utility pickups, while directly competitive products include other equivalent for commercial purposes vehicles, which are adapted to the same use and can be classified under the same category of vehicles. Therefore, any vehicles that can be categorized under the full-sized pickups and sport-utility pickups are considered to be directly competitive with the vehicles manufactured by the subject firm. The analysis of the data revealed that U.S. aggregate imports of full-sized pickups and sport utility pickups declined absolutely and relatively in comparison with sales of U.S.-manufactured full-sized pickups and sport utility pickups from 2007 to 2008 and from January through July 2009 over the corresponding 2008 period.

To support the allegation, the petitioner attached several newspaper articles, alleging that Ford manufactures pickups in Australia, South Africa and Thailand and is increasing its production capacity of Fiesta in Mexico and Canada.

The Department contacted company officials of Ford Motor Company to address the above allegations. The company officials stated that Ford does not produce like or directly competitive products with Ford F Series pickups and Lincoln Mark LT sports-utility pickups in Australia, South Africa and Thailand. The official also stated that vehicles manufactured in Canada are also not like or directly competitive with Ford F Series and Lincoln Mark LT pickups. Moreover, the official stated that Ford Motor Company does not manufacture pickups in Mexico and Canada. The company official confirmed that Ford Motor Company did not shift production of Ford F Series and Lincoln Mark LT pickups from Dearborn, Michigan abroad during the relevant period.

The investigation revealed that the reduction in market share resulted in over-capacity at Ford facilities, and that the layoffs at the subject facility were not related to increased imports of like or directly competitive vehicles with Ford F Series and Lincoln Mark LT pickups and there was no shift of production of these vehicles abroad during the period under investigation.