

5701) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notices were signed on April 22, 2002 and May 3, 2002, respectively and published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22113) and May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35142), respectively.

The initial TAA and NAFTA-TAA petition investigations for workers at Trend Technologies, Round Rock, Texas (TA-W-40,915 & NAFTA-5701) were denied based on the finding that sales and production at the subject firm did not decline during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleged that shifts in subject plant production occurred and supplied various shipping invoices depicting shifts in plant machinery to Guadalajara, Mexico during the relevant period.

A review of the data furnished by the petitioner and further clarification from the company shows that a meaningful portion of subject plant production was shifted to Mexico during the relevant period. The products produced in Mexico by Trend Technologies are then sold to their customer located in Mexico. The subject plant products are not imported back to the United States, but incorporated into the customers' computer products.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm to Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act, I make the following certification:

All workers at Trend Technologies, Round Rock, Texas (NAFTA-05701), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 30, 2000, through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974,

and

I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for TAA under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 for workers and former workers of Trend Technologies, Round Rock, Texas (TA-W-40,915).

Signed in Washington, DC this 17th day of June 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18418 Filed 7-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,471]

#### Besser Company, Alpena, MI; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 26, 2002, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 2002 (67 FR 38523).

The Department initially denied TAA to workers of Besser Company, Alpena, Michigan engaged in the production of concrete machinery and equipment because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met.

On reconsideration, the Department conducted a sample survey of additional major customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of concrete machinery and equipment during the relevant period. The survey revealed that some customers increased their reliance on imported concrete machinery and equipment during the relevant period.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with concrete equipment and machinery, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers of Besser Company, Alpena, Michigan. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Besser Company, Alpena, Michigan engaged in the production of concrete machinery and equipment who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 29, 2000 through two years from date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 12th day of July, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18413 Filed 7-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,492]

#### Coastal Lumber Company, Suffolk, VA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated June 4, 2002, the company 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 May 6, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35340).

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 petition for the workers of Coastal Lumber Company, located in Suffolk, Virginia 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 imports of pine boards while decreasing their purchases from the subject firm during the relevant period.

The petitioner supplied statistics relating to softwood lumber imports for selected countries. The petitioner believes these countries are importing pine boards back to the United States and that the declines in the price of softwood lumber created a surge in imports of softwood lumber during the relevant period, thus impacting the subject plant workers and the softwood lumber industry.

A review of the data supplied by the petitioner depicts the trend in softwood lumber imports for selected countries during the relevant period. However, the softwood lumber statistics supplied by the petitioner is a broad (basket) category and is not specific enough with

the products produced (pine board) by the subject plant and therefore not relevant. The Department conducted a survey, as already indicated, to examine the direct impact of pine board imports on the subject firm worker's during the relevant period. The survey revealed that customer imports did not contribute importantly to the layoffs at the subject plant during the relevant period.

Further, the price of imported softwood lumber is not a relevant factor in meeting the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

#### 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 3rd day of July 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18416 Filed 7-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-39,987]

#### GSI Lumonics Corp., Maple Grove, MN; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of January 9, 2002, an employee requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on December 17, 2001, based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to the layoffs at the subject plant. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 11, 2002 (67 FR 1509).

The request for reconsideration is based on the allegation that specific products produced at the subject plant were shifted to Canada and England, and a meaningful portion of those products were imported back to the United States.

The Department on further review of the investigation and further contact with the company received new information revealing that shifts in plant production (SVS & Silver Cutting Head) to foreign sources occurred during the relevant period. A meaningful portion of that production shifted to foreign sources was imported back to the United States during the relevant period.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at GSI Lumonics, Inc., Maple Grove, Minnesota contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of GSI Lumonics, Inc., Maple Grove, Minnesota who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 21, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 14th day of June, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18414 Filed 7-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,732]

#### LM Services, Cumberland, Maryland; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at LM Services, Cumberland, Maryland. The application contained no new substantial information which would bear importantly on the Department's determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-40,732; LM Services

Cumberland, Maryland (June 24, 2002)

Signed at Washington, DC this 12th day of July, 2002.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02-18417 Filed 7-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,343]

#### Specialty Minerals (Michigan), Inc., Plainwell, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 13, 2002, the company 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 April 24, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 2002 (67 FR 22112).

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 petition for the workers of Specialty Minerals (Michigan), Inc., Plainwell, Michigan 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 denial was based on evidence indicating that customers of the subject firm do not import precipitated calcium carbonate. The subject firm did not import precipitated calcium carbonate.

The company feels that the eligibility criteria were met based on the fact that the subject plant existed to supply the key raw material (precipitated calcium carbonate) to the major customer. The company further states that once the customer closed down, due to imported paper, the subject plant no longer had a customer and as a result was directly impacted by imported paper closing it's primary customer.