The imports of any other product by the company or customer is not relevant to this petition that was filed on behalf of worker(s) producing precipitated calcium carbonate. The products imported must be ''like or directly competitive'' with what the subject plant produces to meet the eligibility requirements of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

**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 14th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–18415 Filed 7–19–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–30–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

**[TA–W–41,142]**

### SPX Valves and Controls, Lake City, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on May 31, 2002, the company 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 SPX Valves and Controls, Lake City, Pennsylvania was issued on May 13, 2002, and will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

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 investigation findings revealed that criterion (2) of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met. Subject firm sales and production of valves increased from 2000 to 2001 and further increased from the January through March 2002 period over the corresponding 2001 period. The workers were engaged in the production of valves.

The request for reconsideration alleges that sales and production although increasing at the subject plant will begin to decline during the third or fourth quarter of 2002. The company further states that the company started importing valve parts (valve bonnets, bodies, actuators and positioners) from foreign sources during January 2002 and has purchase orders to import a meaningful amount of valves during the remainder of the year.

The company request for reconsideration corresponds to the TAA denial which was based on criterion (2) not being met, plant sales and production did not decline during the relevant period.

Imports of valve parts cannot be considered in meeting criterion (3) group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. The reported importation of component parts beginning in January 2002 is not a relevant factor for workers producing valves. The imported product must be like or directly competitive with what the subject firm workers produce (valves).

The petitioner further states that sales and production will decline later this year and also appears to be stating that the company has ordered foreign produced valves which will be imported into the United States in the near future and continue to be imported through the remainder of 2002. If conditions change at the subject firm, the workers are encouraged to reapply for TAA eligibility.

**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 18th day of June, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–18419 Filed 7–19–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–30–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Correction

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, USDOL.

**ACTION:** Correction.

**SUMMARY:** In notice document 02–17599 beginning on page 46214 in the issue of Friday, July 12, 2002, make the following corrections:

On page 46214 in the third column, insert ''*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration'' after ''*Type of Review:* Extension with change'' where ''*Type of Review:* Extension without change'' first appears.

On page 46214 in the third column, insert ''*Title:* Employment Service Complaint Referral'' in the seventh line just before the word ''Record.'' Thus, the beginning of line seven should read as ''*Title:* Employment Service Complaint Referral Record, ETA 8429 and the Services to * * *''

Dated: July 15, 2002.

**Grace A. Kilbane,**

*Administrator, Office of Workforce Security.*

[FR Doc. 02–18412 Filed 7–19–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–30–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

**[NAFTA–05755]**

### Delphi Automotive Systems Corporation, Delphi Delco Electronics Division, Body and Security Team, Oak Creek, WI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 10, 2002, petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for North American Free Trade Agreement—Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA—TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 16, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22115).

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 denial of NAFTA–TAA for workers performing engineering design work at Delphi Automotive Systems Corporation, Delphi Electronics Division, Body and Security Team, Oak Creek, Wisconsin was based on the finding that the workers do not produce an article as required for certification under Section 250(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The petitioners allege that the workers produce a product (prototypes) and that work performed by the subject firm workers was shifted to Mexico.

Review of the investigation shows that subject workers were engaged in engineering design work. Workers at the subject site were also engaged in minor modifications of prototypes that were built at another affiliated domestic facility and then transferred to the subject plant. The engineering design work was shifted to Mexico, no functions relating to minor modifications to the prototypes were shifted to Mexico. The Mexican site is strictly engineering focused, no prototype production is being performed there. The engineering design activities that were shifted to Mexico are service functions only. No subject plant production was shifted to Mexico. Therefore, the workers at the subject firm do not meet the eligibility requirements under section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

**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 18th day of June, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–18421 Filed 7–19–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–30–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

**[NAFTA–5866]**

### Exide Technologies Transportation Business Group Florence, MS; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 13, 2002, the company requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 11, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on April 24, 2002 (67 FR 20167).

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 denial of NAFTA–TAA for workers engaged in activities related to the production of SLI batteries at Exide Technologies, Transportation Business Group, Florence was based on the finding that criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. There were no company imports of SLI batteries from Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm shift production from Florence, Mississippi to Mexico or Canada. The survey conducted by the Department of Labor revealed no increase in customer purchases of SLI batteries from Canada or Mexico during the period.

The petitioner alleges that a major competitor is expanding their production facility in Mexico.

The expansion of a major competitor's Mexican facility producing SLI batteries is not relevant to meeting the eligibility requirements for adjustment assistance under section 250(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The petitioner is further concerned that the customers are not buying the batteries directly from the Mexican facility, but purchasing the imported Mexican batteries from domestic sources and thus the Mexican imports may not show up in the Department of Labor's investigation.

The Department of Labor (DOL) survey tests for imported products that are purchased from domestic sources that are like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produces during the relevant period. The DOL survey revealed that none of customers increased their purchases of imported batteries from Canada or Mexico or other domestic sources that may be importing from Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

On June 5, 2002 the company contacted the Labor Department stating that other Exide Technologies facilities were certified eligible for NAFTA–TAA and that the customer bases of those facilities were similar to subject plant's customer base. Therefore, the company believes that the subject plant should also be certified eligible for NAFTA–TAA based on those certifications.

Examination of previous company wide NAFTA–TAA certifications show that those facilities were certified eligible for NAFTA–TAA based on a major customer increasing their imports of batteries from Mexico during the relevant time period. The subject plant did not sell batteries to that major customer during the relevant time period.

**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 14th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–18425 Filed 7–19–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–30–P**