

TA-W-60,026; BSN-Jobst, Inc.,
Rutherford College, NC: September
6, 2005.

TA-W-60,085; Parker Hannifin Corp.,
Sarasota, FL: September 13, 2005.

TA-W-60,096; General Electric,
Bloomington, IL: September 15,
2005.

TA-W-60,097; Eaton Corporation,
Hutchinson, KS: September 13,
2005.

TA-W-60,136; Owens Brockway,
Godfrey, IL: September 25, 2005.

TA-W-60,167; Andrew Corporation
(AFMA), Amesbury, MA: September
26, 2005.

TA-W-59828; Pfizer, Inc., Kalamazoo,
MI: July 27, 2005.

TA-W-60,069; Cooper Standard
Automotive, Auburn, IN: September
8, 2005.

TA-W-60,079; Allied Motion
Technologies, Owosso, MI:
September 13, 2005.

TA-W-60,095; Regal Electronics, Inc.,
Pocahontas, AR: September 15,
2005.

TA-W-60,130; AJS Controls, Inc.,
Sidney, NY: September 21, 2005.

The following certifications have been issued. The requirements of Section 222(b) (supplier to a firm whose workers are certified eligible to apply for TAA) and Section 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Trade Act have been met.

None.

The following certifications have been issued. The requirements of Section 222(b) (downstream producer for a firm whose workers are certified eligible to apply for TAA based on increased imports from or a shift in production to Mexico or Canada) and Section 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Trade Act have been met.

None.

Negative Determinations for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In the following cases, it has been determined that the requirements of 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) have not been met for the reasons specified.

The Department as determined that criterion (1) of Section 246 has not been met. Workers at the firm are 50 years of age or older.

None.

The Department as determined that criterion (2) of Section 246 has not been met. Workers at the firm possess skills that are easily transferable.

None.

The Department as determined that criterion (3) of Section 246 has not been met. Competition conditions within the workers' industry are not adverse.

None.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the eligibility criteria for worker adjustment assistance have not been met for the reasons specified.

Since the workers of the firm are denied eligibility to apply for TAA, the workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.A.) and (a)(2)(B)(II.A.) (employment decline) have not been met.

TA-W-60,162; Ison Transport Inc.,
Ontonagon, MI.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.B.) (Sales or production, or both, did not decline) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

None.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.C.) (increased imports) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B.) (shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

TA-W-59761; Ace Products, LLC,
Conneautville, PA.

TA-W-59970; TDE Group, Inc.,
Somerset, KY.

TA-W-59989; Canam Metal Products,
Inc., Colton, CA.

TA-W-60,056; Short Bark Industries,
Tellico Plains, TN.

The investigation revealed that the predominate cause of worker separations is unrelated to criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.C.) (increased imports) and (a)(2)(B)(II.C) (shift in production to a foreign country under a free trade agreement or a beneficiary country under a preferential trade agreement, or there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports).

None.

The workers' firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA-W-59,993; Fenton Gift Shops, Inc.,
Williamstown, WV.

TA-W-60,045; International Business
Machines Corp., Rocklin, CA.

TA-W-60,058; Akzo Nobel, Inc.,
Georgetown, SC.

TA-W-60,103; Xerox Corporation,
Wilsonville, OR.

TA-W-60,154; Lucas Ford Lincoln
Mercury, Southold, NY.

The investigation revealed that criteria of Section 222(b)(2) has not been met. The workers' firm (or subdivision)

is not a supplier to or a downstream producer for a firm whose workers were certified eligible to apply for TAA.

None.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the period of October 2 through October 6, 2006. 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: October 12, 2006.

Linda G. Poole,

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E6-18226 Filed 10-30-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-59,846]

Coville, Inc. Winston-Salem, NC; 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 Coville, Inc., Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-59,846; Coville, Inc., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, (October 18, 2006).

Signed at Washington, DC this 23rd day of October 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E6-18218 Filed 10-30-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P