

**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 18th day of March, 2003.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8353 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-50,986]

**F.L. Smithe Machine Company, Inc.,  
Duncanville, PA; Notice of Termination  
of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 26, 2003, in response to a worker petition filed by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local Lodge 2348, on behalf of workers at F.L. Smithe Machine Company, Inc., Duncanville, Pennsylvania.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active certification issued on April 6, 2001 (TA-W-38,752). Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 24th day of March 2003.

**Richard Church,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8343 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-50,907]

**Frametome Connectors, Inc.,  
Communications, Data and Consumer  
Division, Fiber Optics Group, a  
Member of the Areva Group, Etters,  
PA; Notice of Termination of  
Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February

14, 2003 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Frametome Connectors USA, Inc., Communications, Data and Consumer Division, Fiber Optics Group, the Areva Group, Etters, Pennsylvania.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active certification issued on March 26, 2003 and which remains in effect (TA-W-50,122). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of March 2003.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8342 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-51,285]

**Honeywell International, ACS-Control  
Products, Albuquerque, NM; Notice of  
Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 24, 2003 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Honeywell International, ACS-Control Products, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation would serve no purpose and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 25th day of March 2003.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8347 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-42,256]

**Jackson Sewing Center, Madisonville,  
TN; Notice of Negative Determination  
on Reconsideration**

On February 19, 2003, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and

former workers of the subject firm. The notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The Department initially denied the workers of Jackson Sewing Center, Madisonville, Tennessee because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Imports of sewn furniture parts did not contribute importantly to the layoffs at the subject plant. The workers at the subject firm were engaged in employment related to the manufacture (sewing) of upholstered furniture parts. The sewn articles were sent to other affiliated plants to be incorporated into upholstered furniture.

The petitioner asserts that company sales were down and thus the company was attempting to cut costs by importing Chinese products (cut-sewn fabric for furniture) competitive with those produced by the subject plant. The petitioner further alleges that, during September 2002, some "parts" from China were seen at an affiliated plant. The petitioner also supplied style numbers believed to be imported from China.

On reconsideration, the Department contacted the company for further clarification concerning company imports of cut-sewn fabric for upholstered furniture. In response to the style numbers supplied by the petitioner, the company indicated that, with the exception of one style number, they did not import these products. The one style number imported (7866) constituted a negligible amount in relation to production at the subject firm and the company further indicated this was a one time event during 2002, and in fact was not even produced at the subject firm, but rather at an affiliated facility. (However, the subject plant had the capability to produce that style.)

The company also reported that they imported cut-sewn leather furniture parts and tables but that they did not produce cut-sewn leather furniture parts and tables. In any event, the amount of imported cut-sewn leather furniture parts was extremely small in relation to production at the Madisonville plant during January through September 2002. In fact, the imported pre-cut and sewn leather covers were purchased from manufacturers that specialize in producing these products. The company indicated that the investment in equipment and training would far exceed any profitability they could expect in such a program.

The company also indicated that they imported tables during the relevant period. However, since the worker group does not produce this product,

imported tables are not "like or directly" competitive with what the subject plant produced (cut-sewn fabric for furniture parts) and thus does not meet the eligibility requirements of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974.

The plant ships all cut-sewn fabric parts for furniture produced at the subject plant to other affiliated plants that incorporate the sewn parts into furniture; therefore, a customer survey is not relevant to this investigation.

In summary, the sum of cut-sewn fabric and one style of cut-sewn leather furniture parts imported was extremely small amount relative to what the subject plant produced during the relevant period, and therefore did not contribute importantly to layoffs at the subject plant.

The company also indicated that from 2001 to 2002 the styles of furniture have changed and thus require a smaller number of cut sewn furniture parts to produce a piece of furniture.

The company further indicated that the Madisonville plant was an extension for the sewing operation of an affiliated domestic facility. The subject plant was opened several years ago when additional sewing capacity was needed at the affiliated plant, since the labor market was extremely tight. Since less sewing is now required the company decided to shift the sewing operation back to the affiliated plant.

### Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Jackson Sewing Center, Madisonville, Tennessee.

Signed at Washington, DC this 21st day of March 2003.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8350 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,391]

#### Motorola, Inc., Deer Park, IL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on December 19, 2002, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Motorola, Inc., Deer Park, Illinois.

The Department has amended an active certification for workers of Motorola, Inc., Global Telecom Solutions Sector (GTSS) formerly Network Solutions Sector (NSS) (TA-W-40,501), to include the petitioning group of workers.

Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 17th day of March 2003.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8340 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-42,311]

#### New England Iron, LLC, Springfield, MA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application February 6, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on December 13, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on January 9, 2003 (67 FR 1201).

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 petition for the workers of New England Iron, LLC, Springfield, Massachusetts was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imported grey iron castings. The

company did not import grey iron castings in the relevant period.

The petitioner asserts that the subject firm was a tier (2) supplier to a tier (1) company that in turn machined the castings and sold them to an automaker. The petitioner further alleges that this automaker is currently having these machined castings made in Brazil.

In assessing the eligibility of a petitioning worker group for trade adjustment assistance, the Department considers imports that are "like or directly" competitive to those produced by the petitioning worker group. As the grey iron castings that are allegedly imported are subject to further processing (e.g., machined), they would not be considered "like or directly" competitive with the grey iron castings produced by the subject firm, and thus do not meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

### 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 19th day of March 2003.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-8351 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,001 and TA-W-50,001A]

#### Reliant Bolt, Inc., Bedford Park, IL; Reliant Fastener, Rock Falls, IL; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on December 10, 2002, applicable to workers of Reliant Bolt, Inc., Bedford Park, Illinois. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 26, 2002 (67 FR 78817).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information shows that Reliant Fastener, Rock Falls, Illinois is a sister facility of