DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-82,440]
Stone Age Interiors, Inc., D/B/A Colorado Springs Marble and Granite, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Express Employment Professionals, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 16, 2013, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers’ eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Stone Age Interiors, Inc., d/b/a Colorado Springs Marble and Granite, Colorado Springs, Colorado (subject firm). The negative determination was issued on April 15, 2013 and the Notice of Determination was published in the Federal Register on May 15, 2013 (78 FR 28628–28630).

Workers at the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the production of finished stone fabrication. The worker group includes on-site leased workers from Express Employment Professionals.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the Department’s findings that Criterion (2)(A)(ii) has not been met because imports of finished product from China have adversely impacted the business and that the information provided by the subject firm was incomplete and/or misunderstood.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor’s prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of June, 2013.
Del Min Amy Chen, Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-81,414]
TE Connectivity, CIS-Appliances Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Kelly Services, Jonestown, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative determination on Reconsideration

On September 28, 2012, the Department of Labor issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of TE Connectivity, CIS-Appliances Division, Jonestown, Pennsylvania (hereafter referred to as “the subject firm”). The workers are engaged in activities related to the production of electronic components and the supply of administrative support services (in support of production). The worker group includes on-site leased workers from Kelly Services.

Finally, the group eligibility requirements under Section 222(e) of the Act have not been satisfied because Stone Age has not been publically identified by name by the International Trade Commission as a member of a domestic industry in an investigation resulting in an affirmative finding of serious injury, market disruption, or material injury, or threat thereof.

The request for reconsideration alleges that increased imports of finished product from China have adversely impacted the business and that the information provided by the subject firm was incomplete and/or misunderstood.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor’s prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

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 Department’s findings of no increased imports by the subject firm of articles like or directly competitive with the electronic components produced by the subject workers. Further, aggregate imports of articles like or directly competitive with electronic components decreased during the relevant period. The investigation also revealed that the subject firm did not shift the production of electronic components, or a like or directly competitive article, to a foreign country or acquire such production from a foreign country. In addition, the investigation revealed that the subject firm is not a Supplier or Downstream Producer for a firm (or subdivision) that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, have not been satisfied.

In the request for reconsideration, the worker supplied new information regarding a possible shift in the production of like or directly competitive articles to Mexico and/or China. Specifically, the workers alleged that they trained employees from facilities in Mexico and China and that dies were shifted to Mexico and China.

During the reconsideration investigation, the subject firm company official confirmed that the workers of the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the production of electronic components, and that some of the workers performed administrative support services in support of production.

The reconsideration investigation revealed that, although the subject firm shifted a portion of production to Mexico and China, the shift in production represented a negligible portion of overall production volume and, therefore, did not contribute importantly to worker separations or threat of separations.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 7th day of June, 2013.
Del Min Amy Chen, Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.
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