

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *In The Matter of Stooddy Company, Debtor*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-354/9. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The settlement agreement may be examined at the Office of U.S. Attorney, Civil Division, 111 South 10th Street, 18th Floor, St. Louis, Missouri or at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. During the public comment period the settlement agreement also may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html>. A copy of the settlement agreement may be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood (tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$3.00 (12 pages @ 25 cents per page reproduction cost), payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Ellen M. Mahan,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 03-23074 Filed 9-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,834]

Agilent Technologies, Inc., Information Technology Division (IT), Colorado Springs, CO; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of July 17, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA).

The denial notice applicable to workers of Agilent Technologies, Inc., Information Technology Division (IT), Colorado Springs, Colorado was signed on June 16, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on July 3, 2003 (68 FR 39976).

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 TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Agilent Technologies, Inc., Information Technology Division (IT), Colorado Springs, Colorado, engaged in computer consulting services combined with providing information technology. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Act.

The petitioner appears to imply that the petitioning worker group should be considered eligible for TAA on the basis that they served as secondary upstream supplier to a trade certified firm.

In fact, in order to be eligible for TAA, workers must produce an article. Further, in order to meet TAA eligibility requirements as secondary upstream suppliers, the worker group must produce a component part of the product that was the basis of the TAA certification for the customer firm.

Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA, namely the worker separations must be caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article and who are currently under certification for TAA.

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 at Washington, DC, this 13th day of August 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-22996 Filed 9-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,878]

Cannondale Corporation Bicycle Plant Now Known as Cannondale Bicycle Corporation, Bedford, PA; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on April 25, 2003, applicable to workers of the Cannondale Corporation, Bicycle Plant, Bedford, Pennsylvania. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 9, 2003 (68 FR 25060).

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 bicycles, clothing and accessories.

New information shows that Cannondale Corporation, Bicycle Plant became known as Cannondale Bicycle Corporation in May 2003, following bankruptcy in early 2003. Workers separated from employment as the subject firm had their wages reported under a separated unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Cannondale Bicycle 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 Cannondale Corporation, Bicycle Plant who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-50,878 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Cannondale Corporation, Bicycle Plant, now known as Cannondale Bicycle Corporation, Bedford, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 10, 2002, through April 25, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 21st day of August 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-22999 Filed 9-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,405]

Dorr-Oliver Eimco USA, Inc. Formerly Known as Eimco Processing Company, Salt Lake City, UT; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on January 13, 2003, applicable to workers of the Dorr-Oliver Eimco USA, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 6, 2003 (68 FR 6212).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of liquid/solid separation equipment.

New information shows that Dorr-Oliver Eimco USA, Inc., formerly known as Eimco Process Equipment Company, was formed following a merger in November 2002 between GL&V/Dorr-Oliver and Eimco Process Equipment Company, a Division of Baker Hughes, Incorporated.

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 Dorr-Oliver Eimco USA, Inc. who were adversely affected by a shift in production to Mexico, Canada and India.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-50,405 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Dorr-Oliver Eimco USA, Inc., formerly known as Eimco Process Equipment Company, Salt Lake City, Utah, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 20, 2001, through January 13, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 25th day of August 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-23001 Filed 9-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,908]

Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop Including Workers of Jet Research Corporation, Alvarado, Texas; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 4, 2003, applicable to workers of Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop, Alvarado, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 19, 2003 (68 FR 13332).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that worker separations have occurred involving employees of Jet Research Corporation, Alvarado, Texas, employed at Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop, Alvarado, Texas.

The Jet Research Corporation employees were engaged in the production and support of logging tools for oil drilling at the Alvarado, Texas location of the subject firm.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Jet Research Corporation, Alvarado, Texas working at Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop, Alvarado, Texas who were adversely affected by increased imports.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to properly reflect this matter.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-50,908 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop, Alvarado, Texas, including workers of Jet Research Corporation, Alvarado, Texas producing logging tools for oil drilling at Halliburton Formation Evaluation Machine Shop, Alvarado, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 13, 2002, through March 4,

2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 21st day of August, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-22998 Filed 9-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,588]

Murray Engineering, Inc. Complete Design Service, Flint, MI; Notice of Negative Determination On Remand

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the Secretary of Labor's motion for a voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Murray Engineering, Inc. v. U.S. Secretary of Labor*, No. 03-00219.

On February 5, 2003, the Department of Labor (Department) issued a negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) for the workers of Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, Michigan (hereafter referred to as Murray Engineering). The determination was based on the investigation's finding that the workers' firm provided industrial design and engineering services and did not produce an article in accordance with Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. On February 24, 2003, the Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance for Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, Michigan was published in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 8620).

The initial TAA investigation showed that workers at Murray Engineering supplied design and engineering solutions for general manufacturing industries. Workers of Murray Engineering drafted designs and drawings, which were then sent to customers either copied on to a computer disk or CD-Rom, printed out on paper, or electronically. The investigation also revealed that workers of Murray Engineering did not supply components to either a TAA-certified company or an affiliate of a TAA-certified company.

In a letter dated February 19, 2003, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination. The Department