

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.

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 Ford Motor Company, Dearborn Truck Plant, Dearborn, Michigan.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of January 2010.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-897 Filed 1-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-70,516]

Lamb Assembly and Test, LLC, Subsidiary of Mag Industrial Automation Systems, Machesney Park, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated December 1, 2009, petitioners 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 the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on October 22, 2009 and was published in the **Federal Register** on December 11, 2009 (74 FR 65796).

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination, based on the finding that imports of automation equipment and machine tools 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 "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's declining customers. The survey revealed no imports of automation equipment and machine tools by declining customers during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import automation equipment and machine tools nor shift production to a foreign country during the relevant period.

The petitioner stated that workers of the subject firm supplied transmission assembly automation equipment to companies which have been recently certified eligible for TAA. The petitioner provided a list of customers and alleged that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA as secondary impacted workers under Section 222(c).

For the Department to issue a secondary worker certification under Section 222(c), to workers of a secondary upstream supplier, the subject firm must produce for a TAA-certified firm a component part of the article that was the basis for the customers' certification and the certified firm received certification of eligibility for TAA as a primary impacted firm.

The Department has reviewed the list of companies provided by the petitioners. The alleged customers manufacture aluminum transmissions, cases, parts and automobile engines. The subject firm does not act as an upstream supplier, because automation equipment and machine tools do not form component parts of aluminum transmissions, cases, parts and automobile engines. Furthermore, the customers to which the subject firm allegedly supplied articles were not certified as primary firms but were certified for TAA on the basis of a secondary impact. Thus the subject firm workers are not eligible under secondary impact.

The petitioner also stated that workers of Lamb Technicon, a division of Unova, Warren, Michigan and Lake Orion, Michigan were previously certified eligible for TAA. The petitioner appears to allege that because the sister companies of the subject firm were certified eligible for TAA, the workers of the subject firm should be also granted a TAA certification.

The workers of the above mentioned companies were certified eligible for TAA under petition numbers TA-W-40,267 and TA-W-40,267A in July 2002.

When assessing eligibility for TAA, the Department exclusively considers events during the relevant period (from one year prior to the date of the petition). Therefore, events occurring in 2002 are outside of the relevant period and are not considered in this investigation.

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 7th day of January 2010.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-898 Filed 1-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of petitions for modification of existing mandatory safety standards.

SUMMARY: Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and 30 CFR Part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification. This notice is a summary of petitions for modification filed by the parties listed below to modify the application of existing mandatory safety standards published in Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations.