8 CFR 103.7(b)(1), currently seventy dollars (\$70), or a properly documented fee waiver request pursuant to 8 CFR 244.20, must accompany the Form I– 765. An alien who does not request employment authorization must nonetheless file Form I–765 along with Form I–821, but in such cases no fee will be charged.

(6) Pursuant to subsection 244(b)(3)(A) of the Act, the Attorney General will review, at least 60 days before September 17, 1998, the designation of Somalia under the TPS program to determine whether the conditions for designation continue to be met. Notice of that determination, including the basis for the determination, will be published in the **Federal Register**.

(7) Information concerning the TPS program for nationals of Somalia (and aliens having no nationality who last habitually resided in Somalia) will be available at local Immigration and Naturalization Service offices upon publication of this notice.

Dated: July 26, 1997.

## Janet Reno,

Attorney General. [FR Doc. 97–20375 Filed 7–31–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–10–M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

# Employment and Training Administration

### Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of July, 1997.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) that a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) that sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

#### Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA-W-33,574; Active Products Corp, Marion, IN

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

TA-W-33,621; P.B.I. Ltd, New York, NY TA-W-33,664; Merchants Fast Motor

Lines, Odessa, TX

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 22 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA-W-33,514; Spring Industries, Inc., Kershaw, SC

Separations at the subject firm were due to a corporate decision to close the subject plant and source needed supplies from other domestic manufacturers.

TA-W-33,578; Simpson Paper Co., Shasta Mill, Anderson, CA

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

- TA-W-33,568; Burlington Industries, Inc., Charm Tred Spinning Plant, Monticello, AR
- TA–W–33,616; Ladish Malting Co., Jefferson Junction, WI
- TA-W-33,487 & A, B; Medite Corp, Medford, OR, MDF Plant, Medford, OR and Veneer Div., Rogue River, OR

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

## Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name & location for each determination references the impact date for all workers for such determination.

- TA–W–33,547; Borden Prince, Inc., Lowell. MA: May 23. 1996.
- TA-W-33,596; C and H Apparel, Milan, TN: June 10, 1996.
- TA-W-33,520 & A; Delta Apparel Co., Sandersville, GA and Ashburn, GA: March 9, 1996.
- TA-W-33,523; Nu-Kote International, Connellsville, PA: May 13, 1996.

- TA-W-33,531; Nu-Kote International, Derry Div., Derry, PA: May 13, 1996.
- TA-W-33,417; Stanley-Bostitch Co., Stanley Fastening System Div., Sanford, NC: April 3, 1996.
- TA-W-33,530; Tyco Manufacturing, Beaverton, OR, Portland, OR: May 20, 1996.
- TA-W-33,556; Rugged Sport, LLC, Littleton Facility, Littleton, NC: May 22, 1996.
- TA-W-33,508; SPX Corp., Contech Div., Dowagiac, MI: May 6, 1996.
- TA-W-33,588, A,B,C; The Miller Group, Inc., Including H.L. Miller & Son, Port Carbon, PA, Schuylkill Haven, PA, Pine Grove, PA and The Miller Group, Miller Fabrics, Schuylkill Haven, PA: June 10, 1996.
- TA-W-33,482; Vision Technologies LLC, Iron Ridge, WI: May 2, 1996.
- TA-W-33,478; Brian Toggs, Inc., Hobson City, AL: April 28, 1996. TA-W-33,468; National Starch and
- TA-W-33,468; National Starch and Chemical Co., Plainfield, NJ: April 22, 1996.
- TA-W-33,511; Philips Display Components Co., A Div. of North American Philips Corp., Ottawa, OH: May 13, 1996.
- TA–W–33,648; L.A. Jeans, Inc., Commerce, CA: July 3, 1996.
- TA-W-33,462; Spotlight Co., Inc., New York, NY: April 18, 1996.
- TA–W–33,575; Landmark USA Ltd., Berlin, WI: June 4, 1996.
- TA-W-33,565; Concord Fabrics, Inc., New York, NY: June 3, 1996.
- TA-W-33,583; Spotlight Co., Inc., Ashdown, AR: June 6, 1996.
- TA-W-33,580; Impact Furniture Co., Div. of Bassett Furniture Industries, Hickory, NC: June 4, 1996.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.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 as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the month of July, 1997.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) that a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either(2) that sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) that imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases in imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) that there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

#### Negative Determinations NAFTA-TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA-TAA-01714; McNeill Contracting, Belle Glade, FL

NAFTA-TAA-01684; Tubafor Mill, Inc., Morton, WA

NAFTA-TAA-01649 A & B; Medite Corp., Medford, OR, MDF Plant, Medford, OR and Veneer Div., Medford, OR

NAFTA–TAA–01679; Burlington Industries, Inc., Charm Tred Spinning Plant, Monticello, AR

- NAFTA-TAĂ-01689; Emess Lighting, Inc., Ellwood City, PA
- NAFTA-TAA-01735; Ladish Malting Co., Jefferson Junction, WI

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

- NAFTA-TAA-01791; P.B.I., Ltd, New York, NY
- NAFTA-TAA-01660; Nu World Marketing Limited, NCH Promotional Services Div., Coupon Processing Operations, Mascoutah, IL

The investigation revealed that the workers of the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 250(a) of the Trade Act, as amended.

### Affirmative Determinations NAFTA-TAA

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name & location for each determination references the impact date for all workers for such determination.

- NAFTA-TAA-01685; Impact Furniture Co., Div. of Bassett Furniture Industries, Hickory, NC: June 4, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01686; Landmark USA, Ltd, Berlin, WI: June 4, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01697, A & B; The Miller Group, Inc., Including H.L. Miller & Son, Port Carbon, PA, Schuylkill Haven, PA, Pine Grove, PA and Miller Fabrics, Schuylkill Haven, PA: June 9, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01663 & A; Nu-Kote, International Connellsville Div., Connellsville, PA: May 16, 1996 and Derry Div., Derry, PA: May 19, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01669 & A; Tyco Manufacturing, Beaverton, OR and Portland, OR: May 20, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01696; Compaq Computer Corp., Network Products Div., Austin, TX: June 11, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01587, Stanley-Bostitch Co., Stanley Fastening Systems Div., Sanford, NC: March 18, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01676, Rugged Sport, LLC, Littleton Facility, Littleton, NC: May 22, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01792 & A; Motor Coils Manufacturing Co., Braddock, PA and Lawrenceville, PA: June 12, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01639; National Starch and Chemical Co., Plainfield, NJ: April 22, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01740; Plaid Clothing Co., Inc., Cincinnati, OH: May 22, 1996.
- NAFTA-TAA-01804; L.A. Jeans, Inc., Commerce, CA: July 3, 1996.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of July, 1997. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C– 4318, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: July 21, 1997.

#### Russell T. Kile,

Program Manager, Policy & Reemployment Services Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance

[FR Doc. 97–20341 Filed 7–31–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-32,709 and NAFTA-01224]

#### Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated, Washington, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination On Reconsideration 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 Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated* v. *U.S. Secretary of Labor,* No. 97–01– 00175.

The Department's initial denial of TAA for the workers of Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated, Washington, Pennsylvania, issued on November 27, 1996 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 13, 1996 (61 FR 65599), was based on the fact that criterion (3) of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met.

The Department's initial denial of NAFTA-TAA for the same worker group, issued on October 10, 1996 and published in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1996 (61 FR 55882), was based on the fact that criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were not met.

The petitioners' request for reconsideration resulted in a negative determination on reconsideration which was issued on December 27, 1996 and published in the **Federal Register** on January 23, 1997 (62 FR 3528). The Department's findings on reconsideration affirmed that the customers of Penn Mould did not purchase imported glass molds during the relevant time period.

On remand, the petitioners presented additional statistics for U.S. imports of molds for glass, injection or compression type, and other types. Although the aggregate statistics show an increase in imports of molds for glass from 1995 to 1996, the critical determination for the Department is whether the customers of Penn Mould increased their import purchases during the relevant time period.

On remand, the plaintiffs question if the Department gave consideration to the fact that Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated changed from a totally captive mold producer to a commercial producer which expanded their customer base prior to any layoffs. The