article that was the basis of the TAA certification, the workers of the subject firm did not meet the criteria of Section 222(c) and are, therefore, not eligible to apply for TAA as adversely affected secondary workers.

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 Fanuc Robotics America, Inc., Rochester Hills, Michigan.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 13th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18184 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–72,194]

Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., Washougal, WA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 4, 2010, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's certification regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The certification was signed on April 1, 2010, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 2010 (75 FR 24751).

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.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner asserted that she and other workers of the subject firm who were laid off more than a year before the date of the petition (August 24, 2009), and were thus not reached by the impact date of the certification (August 24, 2008), should be included in the certification because of their long-term service to the employer, of their long years of working together with other employees who will be covered by the decision, and they should not be penalized for the alleged delay by the petitioner (a union official) who filed the petition in this case.

The applicable regulation, 29 CFR 90.16(e), states that:

A certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance shall not apply to any worker:

(1) Whose last total or partial separation from the firm or appropriate subdivision occurred more than one (1) year before the date of the petition; * * *

In this case, the petition that began this investigation was dated August 24, 2009. Therefore, according to the regulation above, no worker who was separated earlier than August 24, 2008 (*i.e.,* one year prior to the August 24, 2009 petition date) can be included in any certification resulting from the investigation resulting from the petition at issue.

The petitioner in this case was laid off on August 5, 2008, nineteen days before the earliest possible date for workers to receive benefits under certification TA–W–72,194. Consequently, according to 29 CFR 90.16(e), she cannot be covered by that certification.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered or 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 14th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18187 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–73,199]

Dow Jones & Company, Sharon Pennsylvania Print Plant a Subsidiary of News Corporation, West Middlesex, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated June 21, 2010, 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 the subject firm. The determination was signed on May 21, 2010. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on June 7, 2010 (75 FR 32224). The workers are engaged in the production of print publications.

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 negative determination of the TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at Dow Jones & Company, Sharon Pennsylvania Print Plant, a subsidiary of News Corporation, West Middlesex, Pennsylvania, was based on the finding that the workers' separations were not related to an increase in imports of print publications or a shift in production of print publications to a foreign country, nor did the workers produce a component part that was used by a firm that employed a worker group currently eligible to apply for TAA.

In the request for reconsideration the petitioner stated that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA because the "plates and film came from a company currently approved for TRA, Konica" and that those plates and film directly impacted the subject firm's production.

Increased imports of component parts, tools, or equipment related to the production of printed publications cannot be a basis for TAA certification under Section 222(a)(2)(A) because the statute requires either increased imports

of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the workers' firm, increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles into which one or more component parts produced by the workers' firm are directly incorporated, or increased imports of articles like or directly incorporating one or more component parts produced outside of the United States that are like or directly competitive with imports of articles incorporating one or more component parts produced by the workers' firm.

During the initial investigation, the Department inquired into the allegation that "As of July 2010 our film used to produce the newspaper and made in Japan will no longer be manufactured anywhere." The investigation confirmed that the subject firm produced print publications and revealed that, while there is a general decline of the film manufacturing industry, the separations at the subject firm are unrelated to increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with the print publications produced at the subject firm or a shift of production to a foreign country, or acquisition from a foreign country, of articles like or directly competitive with the print publications produced at the subject firm.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleges that the subject workers are eligible to apply for TAA as adversely affected secondary workers.

The petitioning workers do not meet the criteria set forth in Section 222(c) because the subject firm neither supplied component parts for the product made by a firm that employed a worker group that is currently eligible to apply for TAA (Konica) nor engaged in a further stage of production of the articles produced by a firm that employed a worker group that is currently eligible to apply for TAA (Konica). Neither of those relationships exists between Dow Jones & Company, West Middlesex, Pennsylvania, and any Konica facility.

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 9th day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–18191 Filed 7–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

TA–W–71,483, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Houston, TX; TA–W–71,483A, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Tampa, FL; TA–W–71,483B, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Salt Lake City, UT; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 10, 2010, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was signed on April 16, 2010. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 20, 2010 (75 FR 28301).

Workers of Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division are engaged in employment related to the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services.

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 negative determination applicable to workers and former workers at Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Houston, Texas, Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Tampa, Florida, and Continental Airlines, Inc., Reservations Division, Salt Lake City, Utah, was based on the findings that the subject firm did not, during the period under investigation, shift to a foreign country the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services) or acquire from a foreign country the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services); that the workers' separation, or threat of separation, was not related to any increase in imports of the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services) or the shift/acquisition of the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services (or like or directly competitive services); and that the workers did not supply a service that was directly used in the production of an article or the supply of service by a firm that employed a worker group that is eligible to apply for TAA based on the afore-mentioned article or service.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner states that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible for TAA because the subject firm has shifted abroad the airline travel arrangement and reservation services provided by the workers. The petitioner also asserts that the subject firm has separated additional workers and more separations are anticipated at various locations throughout the United States. Additionally, the petitioner states that the subject firm facility in Denver, Colorado was not considered in the investigation.

During the initial investigation, the Department obtained information that shows that the subject firm did not shift the supply of airline travel arrangement and reservation services to a foreign country and that the worker separations were due to the diminished need for such services due to increased use of technology (on-line self-service reservations systems and electronic ticketing).

Because workers are not eligible to file a petition for locations other than the one at which they are or were employed, the petitioner's assertion that the Department should have included the Denver, Colorado location in the determination is not a basis for reconsideration.

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.