

an affidavit dated November 24, 2004, a petitioner stated that she was separated from the subject company on February 3, 2002; that she worked in the sample and trim departments; that workers were sent to train workers in Mexico; that workers came from Mexico for training from 2000 through 2002; and that production equipment moved to Mexico. SAR 280.

Although the October 1, 2004 letter did not provide dates of the alleged activities and the November 24, 2004 affidavit was provided by a worker who is not, in fact, a member of the subject worker group (she was separated prior to February 11, 2002), the Department nonetheless inquired into whether any of the alleged actions took place during the relevant period in case they could constitute a basis for TAA certification.

According to the company's submissions, workers in Mexico were trained in preparation for the shift of the "Print Shop" label production, trained to use the new ABS computer system to improve production operations, and trained to design patterns and markers. SAR 212, 232. As previously stated, the Department considers the design of patterns and markers to be service work, not the production of an article, so any shift of such design work would be irrelevant. Further, a marker design facility was not created in Mexico until March 2004, well after the relevant period. SAR 242.

As directed, the Department also investigated whether the subject workers could be certified as either service workers or secondarily-impacted workers and determined that there was no activity at the subject facilities that could constitute a basis for certification under either category.

A careful review of the company's submissions shows that, during the relevant period, the El Paso, Texas facilities did not support a domestic production facility negatively-impacted by increased imports or a shift of production abroad and, therefore, do not qualify as a service company. Further, since none of the three El Paso, Texas facilities supplied components to or assemble and/or finish products for an affiliated domestic production facility negatively-impacted by increased imports or a shift of production abroad during the relevant period, the petitioners do not qualify as a secondarily-affected worker group. Rather, the three El Paso, Texas facilities supported a production facility located in Mexico. SAR 237, 274.

In summary, the remand investigation has enabled the Department to determine comprehensively that (1) patterns and markers were generated

and transmitted electronically; (2) production of samples was shifted from the Armour Facility to California, not to Mexico; (3) there has been no importation of samples; (4) samples have been produced for internal use only and have no impact on imports; and (5) there has been no production of jeans by the subject facilities since 2000 (prior to the relevant period).

Conclusion

As the result of the findings of the investigation on remand, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Sun Apparel of Texas, Inc., Armour Facility, El Paso, Texas (TA-W-51,120), Sun Warehouse Facility, El Paso, Texas (TA-W-51,120A), and Goodyear Distribution, El Paso, Texas (TA-W-51,120B).

Signed at Washington, DC this 16th day of December 2004.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5-258 Filed 1-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,002]

Taisho Electric Corporation of America; El Paso, TX; 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 Taisho Electric Corporation of America, El Paso, Texas. 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-56,002; Taisho Electric Corporation of America, El Paso, Texas (January 14, 2005).

Signed at Washington, DC this 18th day of January 2005.

Timothy Sullivan,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5-274 Filed 1-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,126]

Teleflex Automotive, Inc., Waterbury, Connecticut; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on December 3, 2004, in response to a worker petition filed by a State Government representative on behalf of workers at Teleflex Automotive, Inc., Waterbury, Connecticut.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. In order to establish a valid worker group, there must be at least three full-time workers employed at some point during the period under investigation. Workers of the group subject to this investigation did not meet the threshold of employment. Consequently the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of December, 2004.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5-265 Filed 1-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-55,996]

Union Wadding Company; Pawtucket, RI; Notice of Revised Determination of Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

By letter dated December 29, 2004, a company official, requested administrative reconsideration regarding Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The certification for Trade Adjustment Assistance was signed on December 16, 2004. The Notice of determination will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The initial investigation determined that subject worker group possess skills that are easily transferable.

The petitioner provided new information to show that the workers possess skills that are not easily transferable.

At least five percent of the workforce at the subject firm is at least fifty years of age. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.