

(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; Tubaford 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-TAA-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

initial negative determination and negative determination on reconsideration revealed that the subject firm produced molds for its parent company, Ball-Foster Glass Container. On July 1, 1996, when Penn Mould Industries, Incorporated was purchased by Ross Mould, Inc., the Washington, Pennsylvania plant became a commercial production facility. The workers were laid-off on July 5, 1996. A survey of the principal customer of Penn Mould, which account for the predominate proportion of the subject firm's sales, revealed no import purchases of glass forming molds from Mexico, Canada or other foreign sources through September 1996.

On remand, the Department has further determined that criterion (2) of paragraph (a)(1) of Section 250 and Section 222 of the group eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Production of molds at the Washington plant had a negligible decline of 0.7 percent prior to the worker separations.

The plaintiffs also question the accuracy and validity of the customer survey conducted during the investigation. Unless it has definitive information to the contrary, the Department must rely on the information provided by the company and the survey responses from the subject firm customers since the company and the responding customers are in the best position to provide reliable information.

### Conclusion

After reconsideration on remand, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Penn Mould Industries Incorporated, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 10th day of July 1997.

**Curtis K. Kooser,**

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 97-20349 Filed 7-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-33,481]

#### **Abele Knitting Mills, Incorporated, Farmingdale, New York; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on May 12, 1997 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of former workers at Abele Knitting Mills, Incorporated, located in Farmingdale, New York (TA-W-33,481).

The Department of Labor has been unable to locate the company official at the subject firm. Consequently, the Department of Labor cannot conduct an investigation to make a determination as to whether the workers are eligible for adjustment assistance benefits under the Trade Act of 1974.

Therefore, further investigation in this matter would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 18th day of July 1997.

**Curtis K. Kooser,**

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 97-20342 Filed 7-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-33,289]

#### **CDR Ridgway, Ridgway, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application of May 9, 1997, the United Steelworkers of America requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding worker eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance, applicable to workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 28, 1997 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 request for reconsideration claims that the amount of pigment production in the United States has decreased and that the amount of inks and ink related products being shipped into the United States has affected the employment at CDR Ridgway.

In order for the Department to issue a worker group certification, all of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act must be met. Review of the investigation findings show that criterion (2) was not met. Layoffs at the subject firm were the result of the consolidation of pigment production from the subject firm into three other company-owned plants located domestically. Corporate wide sales of pigments increased in 1996 compared to 1995.

### 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 11th day of July 1997.

**Curtis K. Kooser,**

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 97-20351 Filed 7-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-33,404]

#### **Devoe & Reynolds Company, Louisville, Kentucky; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By letter of May 15, 1996, the United Paperworkers International Union (UPIU), Local 7906, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to petition number TA-W-33,404. The denial notice was signed on April 23,