contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 29, 2002 (67 FR 15225).

To support the request for reconsideration, the company indicated that an affiliated facility (Tiffany Knits, Inc., Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania) located at the same location as the subject plant, was certified on May 13, 2002 for TAA under TA-W-40,603. The applicant further stated that the subject plant was in direct support of that facility and had the same customer base.

A review of the allegation and additional information provided by the company shows that the subject firm dved circular knit fabrics (finished) for a TAA certified affiliated facility (Tiffany Knits, Inc., Schuylkill, Pennsylvania) and shipped the dyed circular knitting fabric to the customers. The two companies were owned and operated by the same owner, and served the same customer base. A review of the survey conducted for Tiffany Knits, Inc. shows that a major customer increased their imports of finished circular knit fabric during the relevant period, thus impacting the workers of the subject plant.

# Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Northeast Bleach and Dye, Inc., Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Northeast Bleach and Dye, Inc., Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 13, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 30th day of May, 2002.

#### Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14798 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-40, 216]

# Paul Flagg Leather Company, Sheboygan, WI; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application of May 1, 2002, the company requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination, based on the finding that imports of tanned cowhides (leather) did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant. The denial notice was signed on April 12, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22114).

The company requested reconsideration based on various factors relevant and not relevant to meeting the eligibility requirement under TAA. However, further review of the Department of Labor's survey conducted during the initial investigation shows that a major customer increased their imports of tanned cowhides, while decreasing their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

## Conclusion

After careful consideration of the new facts obtained on reconsideration, it is concluded that increased imports of tanned cowhides, contributed importantly to the decline in production and to the total or partial separation of workers at Paul Flagg Leather Company, Sheboygan, Wisconsin. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following revised determination:

"All workers of Paul Flagg Leather Company, Sheboygan, Wisconsin, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 3, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed in Washington, DC, this 31st day of May, 2002.

## Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14796 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-41,185]

Pittsburgh Logistics Systems, A Subsidiary of Quadrivius, Inc., on Location at LTV Steel Corp., Independence, OH; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of April 29, 2002, the petitioners, 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 was signed on March 29, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2002 (67 FR 18923).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Pittsburgh Logistics Systems, Independence, Ohio engaged in employment related to the management of warehousing and distribution services, was denied because the workers did not produce an article as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioners indicate that their jobs were eliminated due to lack of work caused by an LTV Steel Co., Inc., shutdown. They further state that they believe the closure of LTV Steel Co. is attributed to imports of steel.

The closure of the LTV Steel Company, Inc. is not relevant since the subject workers do not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act. The subject workers may be certified only if their separation was caused importantly by a reduced demand for their services from a parent firm, a firm otherwise related to the subject firm by ownership, or a firm otherwise related to the subject firm by control. Additionally, the reduction in demand for services must originate at a production facility whose workers independently meet the statutory

criteria for certification and the reduction must directly relate to the product impacted by imports.

#### 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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 30th day of May, 2002.

#### Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14790 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-40,906]

# Quark, Inc., Denver, CO; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated on April 11, 2002, a worker of the subject firm 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 Quark, Inc. Denver, Colorado was signed on April 4, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2002 (67 FR 18923).

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 Quark, Inc. Denver, Colorado engaged in activities related to software development. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

In the request for reconsideration, a worker of Quark, Inc. Denver, Colorado

alleged that Quark, Inc. Denver, Colorado shifted their operation to India.

The initial investigation revealed that the workers were engaged in activities related to the development of software. The workers at the subject firm do not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act 1974. In any event, a transfer of a firm's operations to a foreign source is not a relevant factor in meeting the eligibility requirements under the Trade Act of 1974. Imports of a product produced by the subject firm must "contribute importantly" to the layoffs at the subject plant.

### 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 30th day of May, 2002.

#### Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14789 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-41,213]

# VF Playwear, Inc., Corporate Headquarters, Greensboro, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on April 1, 2002 in response to a petition that was filed by a company official on behalf of workers at VF Playwear, Inc., Corporate Headquarters, Greensboro, North Carolina.

An active certification covering the petitioning group of workers is already in effect (TA–W–39,884, as amended). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 25th day of April, 2002.

## Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14791 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[NAFTA-5984]

# Mansfield Plumbing Products, LLC, Kilgore, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with section 250(a), subchapter D, chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on March 12, 2002, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Mansfield Plumbing Products, LLC, Kilgore, Texas.

The petition has been deemed invalid since one of the three petitioners was separated from the subject firm more than one year prior to the date of the petition. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of May, 2002.

#### Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–14793 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

## **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[NAFTA-5990]

# Optek Technology, Inc., Carrollton, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with section 250(a), subchapter D, chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on March 11, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Optek Technology, Inc., Carrollton, Texas.

The petitioning worker group is covered under an existing certification, NAFTA–5803. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.