TA–W–51,235; Fishing Vessel (F/V) Halowawa, Ketchikan, AK: March 12, 2002.
TA–W–51,225; Compton Corp., Naugatuck Facility, Naugatuck, CT: March 13, 2002.
TA–W–51,155; Buckbee-Mears St. Paul, a Div. of BMC, Inc., St. Paul, MN: March 10, 2002.
TA–W–51,147; Manitowoc Boom Trucks, Inc., d/b/a Manitex, York, PA: March 10, 2002.
TA–W–51,143; Tyco Healthcare Retail Group, a Div. of Tyco Healthcare, including leased workers of Manpower and Adecco, Harmony, PA: March 13, 2002.
TA–W–51,135; Advance USA LLC, New Stanton, PA: March 12, 2002.
TA–W–51,124; Pass and Seymour, Compression Molding Group, a subsidiary of Legrand, including leased workers of The Holland Group, Concord, NC: March 6, 2002.
TA–W–51,122; Emerson Appliance Controls, Frankort, IN: March 5, 2002.
TA–W–51,065; GE Interlogix, North St. Paul, MN: March 4, 2002.
TA–W–50,982; Tarkett, Inc., Sample Department, a subsidiary of Domco Tarket, Inc., including leased workers of Hobart-West and Adecco, Newburgh, NY: February 13, 2002.
TA–W–50,882; Pirelli Power and Cable Systems LLC, Energy Div., Colusa, CA: February 3, 2002.
TA–W–50893; Best Manufacturing Group LLC, Griffin, GA: February 10, 2002.
TA–W–50,873; Scantibodies Laboratory, Inc., Pregnancy Test Kit/PTK Quality Control Department, Santee, CA: January 29, 2002.
TA–W–50,871; Jabil Circuit, Inc., St. Petersburg, FL: February 10, 2002.
TA–W–50,851; Sentex Systems, a Div. of Link Door Controls, Chatsworth, CA: January 30, 2002.
TA–W–50,906; ArvinMeritor, Inc., including leased workers of Randstad Staffing, Gordonsville, TN: March 11, 2002.
TA–W–50,824; Formtech Enterprises, Inc., Quick Plastics Div., including leased workers of Kelly Services, Inc., Jackson, MI: February 6, 2002.
TA–W–50,816; Nevamar Co., High Pressure Laminate Div., Hampton, SC: February 4, 2002.
TA–W–50,785; RMI Titanium Co., Niles, OH: January 17, 2002.
TA–W–50,766; Vishay Sprague Sanford, Inc., Sanford, ME: April 4, 2003.
TA–W–50,293; Mitsubishi Electric Automation, Inc., Vernon Hills, IL: December 9, 2001.

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), Subchaper 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 March 2003.

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 increased 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–07626; Maidenform, Inc., Jacksonville, FL
NAFTA–TAA–06288; Regal Plastics, LLC, Roseville, MI

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

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.

None.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

None.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of March 2003. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: March 28, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–8338 Filed 4–4–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,492]

Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on March 3, 2003, a company official 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 Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, Michigan was signed on February 7, 2003, 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 mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of a worker at Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, Michigan engaged in activities related to travel services. The petition was denied because the petitioning worker did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner appears to allege that ''the 'article' definitions from the U.S.

Code Collections'' support the argument that travel services constitute production. The petitioner further states that ''as you can see, the code and hard data evidence I provided with my petition are synonymous.'' When the petitioner was contacted in regard to what was meant by ''US Code Collections'', she clarified that she meant section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974.

Of the several attachments sent with the original petition, the first is a letter written by the petitioner stating why the worker produced a product. The petitioner states that subject firm services required ''skills and tools'' to produce. When contacted for further clarification, the petitioner stated that the complexity of the work involved, including the fact that multiple airline carrier inventories were consulted to produce a single ticket, deserved consideration of the work as production.

The sophistication of the work involved is not an issue in ascertaining whether the petitioning workers are eligible for trade adjustment assistance, but rather only whether they produced an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974.

In the letter attached to the petition, the petitioner also asserts that the tickets produced by the subject firm are ''tangible'' and states that she ''has boxes and files of these very real copies of (travel) contracts''.

The fact that the terms of travel contract services performed by the petitioner are printed on paper does not constitute production of an article within the meaning of section 222(3).

The second attachment appears to be the first page of an e-mail from the ''Chairman of Congressional Travel Industry Caucus'' to Attorney General Ashcroft, with a section circled alleging that ''major carriers'' are engaging in unfair taxation and commission standards regarding U.S. and Canadian travel agents relative to ''foreign'' travel agents.

The information in this attachment has no bearing on the reason for denying the petitioning worker; an article was not produced within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act.

The third attachment is an untitled single page that appears to be printed from the internet. At the top of the page there is a table with the heading ''NAFTA by Country Trade Comparisons, 1992.'' The petitioner has circled a paragraph below this that suggests that there is a downward trend in U.S. production and a corresponding increase in U.S. service industries.

This information is irrelevant to the criteria used to assess eligibility for trade adjustment assistance.

The next attachment is titled ''Upheaval in Travel Distribution: Impact on Consumers and Travel Agents'' and appears to be an excerpt of a study authored by a congressional commission. On the first page, a section has been highlighted by the petitioner that describes the mission of the study to establish ''whether there are impediments to obtaining information about the airline industry's services and products.'' It seems to be the intent of the petitioner to assert that this congressional commission may be referring to the ''airline contracts'' (as noted on petition) processed by the petitioner as products, and that, as a result, the worker should be considered eligible for trade adjustment assistance. In another section circled by the petitioner, a section notes that ''internet technology is not going to save consumers from airline domination of retailing.'' Again, the petitioner appears to believe that commission's use of words (specifically, retailing) merit the acknowledgement of airline tickets as products.

In fact, the processing of contracts and/or tickets does not constitute production within the meaning of section 222(3).

Upon further review, the Department has determined that, even if the petitioning worker were considered a production worker, criterion (1) has not been met. Section 222 of the Trade Act defines an eligible worker ''group'' as ''three or more workers in a firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof.''

The investigation revealed that the subject firm is owner-operated and there are no employees of the firm.

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 in Washington, DC, this 20th day of March 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–8357 Filed 4–4–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,320]

American Bag Corporation, Stearns Plant, Stearns, KY; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of January 23, 2003, a company official 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 January 3, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on February 4, 2003 (67 FR 5654).

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 American Bag Corporation, Stearns Plant, Stearns, Kentucky engaged in the production of airbags, was denied because criterion (1) was not met. Employment did not decline in the relevant period, but in fact increased from January through November of 2002 relative to the same time period in 2001.

In the request for reconsideration, the company official confirms that there were no employment declines in the relevant period. However, he also asserts that the reason for this was that workers laid off from the Stearns facility were replaced with workers from American Bag Corporation, Winfield, Kentucky (workers at this facility are currently certified for trade adjustment assistance through August 29, 2003). The official concludes that, on a corporate wide level, employment levels for workers engaged in production of airbags did decline in the relevant period.

When assessing eligibility for trade adjustment assistance, the Department exclusively considers the relevant employment data for the facility where the petitioning worker group was employed. Thus corporate employment levels, in this context, are irrelevant. As