

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.