

workers of Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire was issued on April 2, 2002, and was 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 investigation findings revealed that criterion (2) of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met. Plant sales and production of networking products PCBA and chassis assemblies increased from 2000 to 2001.

The request for reconsideration alleges that sales and production at the subject plant declined during the latter part of 2001. The petitioner attached various news articles to attempt to illustrate declines in sales and production during the relevant period.

The company reported increased sales and production at the subject plant in 2001 over the corresponding 2000 period. Further review of the initial investigation shows that the preponderance in the declines in employment at Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire is the direct result of plant production being shifted to a foreign source during the latter part of 2001 and those products are not being imported back to the United States during the relevant period. Thus on further analysis criterion (3) group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 also was not met. Imports did not contribute importantly to the subject plant layoffs.

The petitioner further states that the company turned down work because of it being too labor intensive, the company is restructuring their operations in the United States, Western Europe and Asia and that production will be moved to lower-cost regions such as Mexico. None of these factors are a basis for certifying the worker group at Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

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 31st day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02-14786 Filed 6-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,610]

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, East Gadsden, AL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of April 3, 2002, the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, CLC, Local Union No. 12L 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 4, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2002 (67 FR 13010).

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 Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, East Gadsden, Alabama engaged in the production of passenger radial tires and light truck tires, was denied because criteria (2) was not met. Production of passenger radial tires and light truck tires at the subject plant increased from 2000 to 2001.

The request for reconsideration alleges that company wide sales of tires declined during the relevant period. The petitioner attached various news articles to illustrate declines in company sales during the relevant period.

An examination of Goodyear Tire and Rubber's 2001 *Annual Report* shows that the company's tire sales declined during the 2001 period over the corresponding 2000 period. Further examination of the 2001 *Annual Report* shows that the preponderance in the declines in company tire sales is related to lost business in foreign countries, rather than lost domestic tire sales.

A further review of aggregate U.S. imports of radial tires shows that imports declined in the year 2001 compared to 2000. Also, the company did not import articles like or directly competitive with articles produced at the subject firm.

Thus, on further analysis, criterion (3) group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 also was not met. Imports of radial tires did not contribute importantly to the subject plants layoffs. Analysis of information provided indicates that any fluctuation in corporate wide sales appears related to a global slowdown, rather than imports impacting 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 3rd day of June, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02-14788 Filed 6-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,572]

Northeast Bleach and Dye, Inc., Schuylkill Haven, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of April 15, 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 issued on March 18, 2002, based on the finding that imports of dyed yarn and fabric did not

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 dyed 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 Quadrius, 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