The amended notice applicable to TA–W–64,529 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Broyhill Furniture Industries, Lenoir Chair #3, aka Lenoir Plant, including on-site leased workers from Onin Staffing, formerly Mulberry Group, Quick Temps/Temps USA, Foothills Temp Employment and ESI Employment Staffing, Lenoir, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 17, 2007 through December 5, 2010, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 18th day of February 2009.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–4401 Filed 3–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–64,801; TA–W–64,801A]

Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., Formerly Known as Tekonsha Towing, Angolia, IN; Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., Formerly Known as Tekonsha Towing, McAllen, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on January 15, 2009, applicable to workers of Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., Angolia, Indiana and Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., McAllen, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 2, 2009 (74 FR 5870).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in activities related to warehousing and distribution supporting Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., Tekonsha, Michigan, a currently TAA-certified worker group.

Information also shows that some workers separated from employment at the subject firm had their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Tekonsha Towing.

Accordingly, the Department is amending this certification to properly reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of the subject firm who were adversely affected by increased imports of brake controls, breakaway kits and lights produced at the Tekonsha, Michigan location of the subject firm.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–64,801 and TA–W–64,801A are hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., formerly known as Tekonsha Towing, Angola, Indiana (TA–W–64,801) and Cequent Electrical Products, Inc., formerly known as Tekonsha Towing, McAllen, Texas (TA–W–64,801A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 30, 2007 through January 15, 2011, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 18th day of February 2009.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–4402 Filed 3–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–65,291]

Bassett Furniture Outlet; Bassett, VA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 10, 2009 in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of workers of Bassett Furniture Outlet, Bassett, Virginia.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of February 2009.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–4385 Filed 3–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–63,805]

International Paper Company, Pensacola Mill, Cantonment, FL; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On December 3, 2008, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2008 (73 FR 76057).

The initial investigation, which was filed on behalf of workers at International Paper Company, Pensacola Mill, Cantonment, Florida engaged in the production of linerboard and fluff pulp, was denied because criteria (1)(2)(A)(I.B) and (1)(2)(A)(II.A) had not been met. The subject firm did not separate or threaten to separate a significant number or proportion of workers as required by Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that workers of the subject firm used to produce uncoated freesheet (copy paper) products. The petitioner also stated that in 2006 the subject firm discontinued production of uncoated freesheet paper and was certified eligible for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The petitioner requested an extension of TAA certification for workers of the subject firm who lost employment or would be terminated from the subject facility after the expiration date of the previous certification, based on the same evidence revealed in the investigation in 2006. The petitioner seems to allege that because the subject firm was previously certified eligible for TAA, the workers of the subject firm should be granted another TAA certification.

The investigation revealed that the workers of the subject firm were certified eligible for TAA (TA–W–59,338) on May 8, 2006 based on increased imports of uncoated freesheet paper. The investigation also revealed that production of uncoated freesheet paper at the subject firm ceased in May 2007. At that time, the subject facility was converted to manufacture linerboard and fluff pulp.

When assessing eligibility for TAA, the Department exclusively considers employment, sales, production and import impact during the relevant period (from one year prior to the date of the petition). Therefore, events

occurring prior to July 31, 2007 are outside of the relevant period and are not relevant in this investigation as established by the petition date of July 31, 2008. The investigation revealed that there was no production of uncoated freesheet paper at the subject facility during the relevant period.

The petitioner also provided additional information regarding employment and layoffs at the subject firm.

Upon further review of the employment data provided by the company official of the subject firm, it was determined that employment at the subject firm declined during the relevant period.

In order to establish import impact and whether imports contributed importantly to worker separations, the Department must consider imports that are like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm (linerboard and fluff pulp) during the relevant period. The ''contributed importantly'' test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm regarding their import purchases.

On reconsideration the Department conducted a survey of the subject firm's domestic customers regarding their purchases of linerboard and fluff pulp during 2006, 2007, January through July, 2007 and January through July, 2008. The survey revealed that the customers did not increase their imports of linerboard and fluff pulp while decreasing purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

Furthermore, as stated in the initial investigation sales and production of linerboard and fluff pulp did not decline during the relevant period through July 2008.

If conditions have changed since July 2008, the company is encouraged to file a new petition on behalf of the worker group which will encompass an investigative period that will include these changing conditions.

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 International Paper Company, Pensacola Mill, Cantonment, Florida.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of February 2009.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–4394 Filed 3–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–59,517]

Advanced Electronics, Inc., Boston, MA; Notice of Negative Determination on Remand

On November 18, 2008, the U.S. Court of International Trade (USCIT) remanded to the Department of Labor (Department) for further investigation *Former Employees of Advanced Electronics, Inc.* v. *United States Secretary of Labor* (Court No. 06–00337).

On July 18, 2006, the Department issued a Negative Determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Advanced Electronics, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts (subject firm). The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on August 4, 2006 (71 FR 44320). Prior to separation, the subject workers produced printed circuit board assemblies.

The negative determination was based on the Department's findings that, during the relevant period, the subject firm did not shift production of printed circuit board assemblies to a foreign country, that the subject firm did not import printed circuit board assemblies (or like or directly competitive articles), and that the subject firm's major declining customers did not import printed circuit board assemblies (or like or directly competitive articles). Further, the Department determined that a portion of the decline in company sales of printed circuit board assemblies is attributed to declining purchases from a foreign customer during the relevant period.

Administrative reconsideration was not requested by any of the parties pursuant to 29 CFR section 90.18.

On October 23, 2007, the USCIT granted the Department's request for voluntary remand to conduct further investigation to determine whether, during the relevant period, any of the foreign customer's facilities located in the United States received printed circuit boards produced by the subject firm and, if so, whether the facility(s) had imported articles like or directly competitive with the printed circuit board assemblies produced by the subject firm.

Based on information obtained during the first remand investigation (that the subject firm sent the articles purchased by the foreign customer to a facility located outside of the United States), the Department determined that the foreign customer did not import articles like or directly competitive with the printed circuit board assemblies produced by the subject firm. On December 17, 2007, the Department issued a Notice of Negative Determination on Remand. The Department's Notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on December 31, 2007 (72 FR 74340).

Although the USCIT stated in its November 18, 2008 opinion that substantial evidence supported the Department's finding that increasing imports of like or directly competitive articles did not contribute importantly to the subject firm's decreased sales to domestic customers, the USCIT also stated that it ''declines to adopt a construction of the Act under which Labor need never consider, in any circumstances, whether increased imports of a like or directly competitive article contributed importantly to a plaintiff's separation by causing the employer to lose business from a customer outside of the United States.''

The USCIT, in its November 18, 2008 order, directs the Department during the second remand investigation to ''determine whether, and to what extent, an increase in imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with the Company's printed circuit boards caused the Company to lose business from its foreign customer.''

On second remand, the Department conducted an investigation to determine whether the foreign customer switched its order from the subject firm to another domestic firm that imported some or all of the printed circuit boards it supplied to the subject firm's foreign customer.

In order to apply for TAA based on increased imports, the subject worker group must meet the group eligibility requirements under Section 222(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. Under Section 222(a)(2)(A), the following criteria must be met:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated; *and*

B. The sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely; *and*

C. Increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in