

totally or partially separated, or are threatened with such separation; that Section 222(a)(2)(A)(i) has been met because U.S. Steel Tubular Products sales and/or production of steel drill pipe and drill collars have decreased; that Section 222(a)(2)(A)(ii) has been met because aggregate imports of articles like or directly competitive with steel drill pipe and drill collars produced by U.S. Steel Tubular Products have increased during the relevant period; and that Section 222(a)(2)(A)(iii) has been met because increased aggregate imports contributed importantly to the worker group separations and sales/production declines at U.S. Steel Tubular Products.

Conclusion

After careful review of previously-submitted facts and new facts obtained during the amendment investigation, I determine that workers of U.S. Steel Tubular Products, McKeesport Tubular Operations Division, a subsidiary of United States Steel Corporation, McKeesport, Pennsylvania, who were engaged in employment related to the production of steel drill pipe and drill collars, meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of U.S. Steel Tubular Products, McKeesport Tubular Operations Division, a subsidiary of United States Steel Corporation, McKeesport, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 19, 2011, through January 28, 2013, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on January 28, 2013 through January 28, 2015, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 5th day of June, 2013.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2013-14853 Filed 6-20-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-82,396]

Sealy Mattress Company; A Subsidiary of Sealy, Inc.; Including On-Site Leased Workers From Express Employment Professionals; Portland, Oregon; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 16, 2013, United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW), Local 330, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of Sealy Mattress Company, a subsidiary of Sealy, Inc., Portland, Oregon (subject firm). The Department's Notice of Determination was issued on April 15, 2013 and was published in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 2013 (78 FR 28630).

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 negative determination of the TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at the subject firm was based on the Department's findings that, during the relevant period, neither the subject firm nor its customers increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with mattresses or box springs produced by the subject firm; the subject firm did not shift production of mattresses and/or box springs, or like or directly competitive articles, to a foreign country, and did not acquire such production from a foreign country; the subject firm is neither a Supplier nor Downstream Producer to a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a); and the subject firm has not been publically identified by name by the International Trade Commission

as a member of a domestic industry in an investigation resulting in an affirmative finding of serious injury, market disruption, or material injury, or threat thereof.

The request for reconsideration stated that the workers of the subject firm should be eligible to apply for TAA because workers at the subject firm were impacted by foreign competition of imported mattresses and box springs. The request also asserts that increased imports should be measured both absolutely and relative to domestic production, as required by applicable regulation. The request further states that the subject firm is a Downstream Producer to a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a).

The request for reconsideration includes a reference to a blog that reported that imports of mattresses have increased since 2003, import data that shows that imports of bedding foundations (which are directly competitive with box springs) decreased in 2012 from 2011 levels, a list of bedding companies and sawmills that employed workers who are eligible to apply for TAA, and references on-line articles regarding Sealy Mattress.

During the review of the application, the Department carefully reviewed the USW's request for reconsideration (including the attachments), the existing record, and the articles referenced in the application ("Sealy opens first factory in China"; February 2011; <http://bedtimesmagazine.com> and "Sealy Opens New Toronto Facility"; October 15, 2008; <http://furninfo.com>).

The request for reconsideration did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination. Based on these findings, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After careful 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 in Washington, DC, this 7th day of June, 2013.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2013-14849 Filed 6-20-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-82,440]

Stone Age Interiors, Inc., D/B/A Colorado Springs Marble and Granite, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Express Employment Professionals, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 16, 2013, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Stone Age Interiors, Inc., d/b/a Colorado Springs Marble and Granite, Colorado Springs, Colorado (subject firm). The negative determination was issued on April 15, 2013 and the Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 2013 (78 FR 28628-28630). Workers at the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the production of finished stone fabrication. The worker group includes on-site leased workers from Express Employment Professionals.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the Department's findings that Criterion (2)(A)(ii) has not been met because imports of articles like or directly competitive with finished stone fabrication produced by Stone Age did not increase during the relevant period.

With respect to Section 222(a)(2)(B) of the Act, the investigation revealed that Stone Age did not shift production of finished stone fabrication, or like or directly competitive articles, to a foreign country, or acquire such production from a foreign country.

With respect to Section 222(b)(2) of the Act, the investigation revealed that Stone Age is neither a Supplier nor Downstream Producer to a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a).

Finally, the group eligibility requirements under Section 222(e) of the Act have not been satisfied because Stone Age has not been publically identified by name by the International Trade Commission as a member of a domestic industry in an investigation resulting in an affirmative finding of serious injury, market disruption, or material injury, or threat thereof.

The request for reconsideration alleges that increased imports of finished product from China have adversely impacted the business and that the information provided by the subject firm was incomplete and/or misunderstood.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of June, 2013.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2013-14854 Filed 6-20-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-81,414]

TE Connectivity, CIS-Appliances Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Kelly Services, Jonestown, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On September 28, 2012, the Department of Labor issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of TE Connectivity, CIS-Appliances Division, Jonestown, Pennsylvania (hereafter referred to as "the subject firm"). The workers are engaged in activities related to the production of electronic components and the supply of administrative support services (in support of production). The worker group includes on-site leased workers from Kelly Services.

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the Department's findings of no increased imports by the subject firm of articles like or directly competitive with the electronic components produced by the subject workers. Further, aggregate imports of articles like or directly competitive with electronic components decreased during the relevant period. The investigation also revealed that the subject firm did not shift the production of electronic components, or a like or directly competitive article, to a foreign country or acquire such production from a foreign country. In addition, the investigation revealed that the subject firm is not a Supplier or Downstream Producer for a firm (or subdivision) that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a), and that the group eligibility requirements under Section 222(e) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, have not been satisfied.

In the request for reconsideration, the worker supplied new information regarding a possible shift in the production of like or directly competitive articles to Mexico and/or China. Specifically, the workers alleged that they trained employees from facilities in Mexico and China and that dies were shifted to Mexico and China.

During the reconsideration investigation, the subject firm company official confirmed that the workers of the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the production of electronic components, and that some of the workers performed administrative support services in support of production.

The reconsideration investigation revealed that, although the subject firm shifted a portion of production to Mexico and China, the shift in production represented a negligible portion of overall production volume and, therefore, did not contribute importantly to worker separations or threat of separations.