

APPENDIX—Continued

[TAA petitions instituted between 11/1/10 and 11/5/10]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
74831	CompuCom Systems (Workers)	Menlo Park, CA	11/05/10	11/02/10
74832	SK Hand Tools Corporation (Union)	Defiance, OH	11/05/10	11/02/10
74833	Franklin Electric Company, Inc. (Company)	Oklahoma City, OK	11/05/10	11/03/10
74834	Fleck (State/One-Stop)	Brookfield, WI	11/05/10	11/02/10
74835	Euchre Mountain Logging, Inc. (Company)	Condon, MT	11/05/10	10/17/10
74836	Journal Community Publishing (Workers)	Waupaca, WI	11/05/10	10/30/10

[FR Doc. 2010-29425 Filed 11-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-73,963]

Dentek.Com, Inc. D/B/A Nsequence Center for Advanced Dentistry Reno, NV; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated July 16, 2010, the 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 August 13, 2010. The Department's Notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**. Workers at the subject firm are engaged in employment related to the production of dental prosthetics (such as crowns and the bridges).

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 applicable to workers and former workers at Dentek.com, Inc., d/b/a nSequence Center for Advanced Dentistry, Reno, Nevada (the subject firm) was based on the findings that the subject firm did not, during the period under investigation, shift to a foreign country production of dental prosthetics, or articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the

workers, or acquire these articles from a foreign country; that the workers' separation, or threat of separation, was not related to any increase in imports of dental prosthetics, or like or directly competitive articles; and that the workers did not produce an article or 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 aforementioned article or service.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department obtained new information from the subject firm regarding imports and its operations and reviewed publically available information regarding the subject firm and its operations, as well as additional information provided by the petitioner.

In a subsequent letter to the Department, the petitioner states that, in 2008, "the decision was made to begin in earnest to out-source all of the crown and the bridge except for the extreme rush cases" and, as a result of the action, "all of the staff was released." The petitioner also alleges that vendors such as the subject firm send orders "directly to China."

Information obtained during the reconsideration investigation confirmed that the subject firm did not shift production of dental prosthetics, or like or directly competitive articles, to a foreign country, and that, during the relevant period, the subject firm did not increase its imports of dental prosthetics, or like or directly competitive articles.

A customer survey was not conducted during the reconsideration investigation because the customers of the subject firm are individual dental health care professionals and not firms. Further, the prosthetics are custom-made for the patients of the customers.

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 10th day of November, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-29432 Filed 11-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-73,695]

Woodland Mills Corporation Mill Spring, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated July 22, 2010 petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding the eligibility of workers and former workers of Woodland Mills Corporation, Mill Spring, North Carolina, to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance. On August 4, 2010, the Department issued a Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration. The Department's Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on August 13, 2010 (75 FR 49524). Workers at the subject firm are engaged in employment related to the production of cotton yarn.

The information collected during the reconsideration investigation revealed

that, during the period of investigation, imports of articles directly incorporating cotton yarn produced outside the United States that are like or directly competitive with imports of articles incorporating cotton yarn produced by Woodland Mills Corporation, Mill Spring, North Carolina Woodland Mills Corporation, Mill Spring, North Carolina had increased, and the increased imports contributed importantly to worker separations and declines in sales and production at the afore-mentioned firm.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained during the reconsideration investigation, I determine that workers of Woodland Mills Corporation, Mill Spring, North Carolina, who are engaged in employment related to the production of cotton yarn, 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 Woodland Mills Corporation, Mill Spring, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after March 10, 2009, through two years from the date of this revised 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 10th day of November, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-29430 Filed 11-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-73,281]

Shorewood Packaging, a Subsidiary of International Paper Company, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Ameristaff Staffing, Danville, VA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated September 7, 2010 the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade

Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on August 19, 2010 and the Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 3, 2010 (75 FR 54187). The workers produce cigarette cartons.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the findings that the subject firm did not shift to/acquire from a foreign country the production of articles like or directly competitive with cigarette cartons; that neither the subject firm nor its major declining customers increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with cigarette cartons; that the subject workers are not adversely affected secondary workers; and the International Trade Commission did not identify the subject firm by name as an injured member of a domestic industry in an investigation pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department reviewed additional information provided by the petitioner and previously-submitted information, as well as additional information obtained from other sources.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department confirmed that the subject firm supplied folding cartons used primarily in the tobacco market and confirmed the subject firm's customer base. During the reconsideration investigation, the Department received new information regarding the relationship between the subject firm and a major declining customer and the operations of the customer, with regards to cigarette cartons.

Based on the new information, the Department determines that the subject firm is a supplier to a firm that employs a worker group currently eligible to apply for TAA; the supply of the component part is related to the finished article that is the basis for the TAA certification; and the firm accounts for at least twenty percent of the production or sales of the subject firm.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained during the reconsideration investigation, I determine that workers of Shorewood Packaging, a subsidiary of International Paper Company, Danville, Virginia, meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(c) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(c). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

“All workers of Shorewood Packaging, a subsidiary of International Paper Company, including on-site leased workers from Ameristaff Staffing, Danville, Virginia, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 12, 2009, through two years from the date of this revised 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 10th day of November, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-29435 Filed 11-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-73,210; TA-W-73,210A]

Metlife Technology, Operations, and Information Technology Groups Including On-Site Leased Workers From Adecco, Cognizant, IBM, Infosys, Kana, Patni, Siemens, Tapfin, Veritas Moosic, PA, Metlife Technology, Operations, and Information Technology Groups Including On-Site Leased Workers From At&T Solutions, Chimes, Cognizant, Patni, Siemens, Xerox Clarks Summit, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application dated August 2, 2010 petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding the eligibility of workers and former workers of MetLife, Technology, Operations, and Information Technology Groups, Moosic, Pennsylvania (TA-W-73,210) and MetLife, Technology, Operations, and Information Technology Groups, Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania (TA-W-73,210A), to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). On August 13, 2010, the Department issued a Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration. The Department's Notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

Workers at the subject facilities are engaged in employment related to the supply of software testing and quality assurance services, and are not separately identifiable by service supplied.