

assistance (TA-W-39,329) was amended on January 15, 2002, to include the workers of DyStar LP, Corporate Office, Charlotte, North Carolina (TA-W-39,329A), who provided administrative support services for the production of textile reactive dyes. The notice of the amended certification was published in the **Federal Register** on February 5, 2002 (67 FR 5295). That amended certification expired on December 7, 2003.

To avoid an overlap in worker group coverage, the amended certification for TA-W-40,717A is again being amended to change the impact date from January 9, 2001, to December 8, 2003.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-40,717A is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of DyStar LP, Corporate Office, Charlotte, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 8, 2003, through May 6, 2004, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 5th day of May, 2004.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 04-11628 Filed 5-21-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-54,221]

#### **Greif Brothers Service Corporation Industrial Packaging and Service Division Kingsport, TN; 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 Greif Brothers Service Corporation, Industrial Packaging and Service Division, Kingsport, Tennessee. 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-54,221; Greif Brothers Service Corporation Industrial Packaging and Service Division Kingsport, Tennessee (May 7, 2004)

Signed at Washington, DC this 13th day of May 2004.

**Timothy Sullivan,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 04-11623 Filed 5-21-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-54 569]

#### **Honeywell Aerospace, Inconel Team, a Division of the Engine Systems and Accessories Division, a Division of Honeywell, Tempe, AZ; Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 23, 2004, in response to a worker petition filed a state agency representative on behalf of workers at Honeywell Aerospace, Inconel Team, a division of the Engine Systems and Accessories Division, a division of Honeywell, Tempe, Arizona.

All workers were separated from the subject firm more than one year before the date of the petition. Section 223(b) of the Act specifies that no certification may apply to any worker whose last separation occurred more than one year before the date of the petition. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of April, 2004.

**Richard Church,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 04-11629 Filed 5-21-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-54 086]

#### **Loislaw.Com, Inc., Van Buren, AR; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application postmarked March 5, 2004, a petitioner 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 Loislaw.com, Inc., Van Buren, Arkansas was signed on February 9, 2004, and published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 2004 (69 FR 11888).

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 workers at Loislaw.com, Inc., Van Buren, Arkansas engaged in data entry by digitizing existing public records and making them accessible in an on-line database. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Act.

The petitioner contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of work performed at the subject facility as a service and further described the functions performed by workers of the subject firm, which consist of editing, coding, quality control and building of the legal material to the internet and CD-ROM. The petitioner further states that edited material put on CD-ROM and the Internet for further consumption by the paying public is a commodity of convenience for the legal profession and should be considered a product.

A company official was contacted for clarification in regard to the nature of the work performed at the subject facility. The official stated that workers at the subject firm are engaged in publishing and collection of electronic and print legal and public records data, which is further digitized into a proprietary format. The official further clarified that only a small portion of the databases are distributed via CD-ROM, with the vast majority of the database customers receiving the edited and digitized data over the internet. According to the company official the burning process of the data on CD-ROM is performed at the subject facility in Van Buren, Arkansas.

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 of the Trade Act of 1974.