

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training  
Administration**

[TA-W-56,498]

**Marsh Advantage America,  
Spartanburg, SC; Notice of  
Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 4, 2005, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers of Marsh Advantage America, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 8th day of February, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade  
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1140 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training  
Administration**

[TA-W-56,434]

**Metso Minerals Industries, Inc.,  
Keokuk, IA; Notice of Termination of  
Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on January 31, 2005, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Metso Minerals Industries, Inc., Keokuk, Iowa.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn.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

Signed in Washington, DC, this 7th day of February, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade  
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1137 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training  
Administration**

[TA-W-56,580]

**Milliken & Company, Magnolia  
Finishing Plant Division, Blacksburg,  
SC; Notice of Termination of  
Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 15, 2005, in response to a worker petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Milliken & Company, Magnolia Finishing Plant Division, Blacksburg, South Carolina.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn.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

Signed in Washington, DC this 24th day of February, 2005.

**Richard Church,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade  
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1154 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training  
Administration**

[TA-W-50,588]

**Murray Engineering, Inc. Complete  
Design Service, Flint, MI; Notice of  
Negative Determination on Remand**

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) remanded to the Department of Labor for further investigation *Former Employees of Murray Engineering v. U.S. Secretary of Labor*, USCIT 03-00219. The Department concludes that the subject worker group does not qualify for eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) benefits. There was neither a shift of production, nor increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject facility, as required under section 222(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (Trade Act). The workers also do not qualify as adversely affected secondary workers under section 222(b) of the Trade Act.

On January 15, 2003, a petition was filed on behalf of workers of Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, Michigan ("Murray Engineering") for TAA. The petition stated that workers design automotive gauges, tools, fixtures, and dies.

The Department's initial negative determination for the former workers of

Murray Engineering was issued on February 5, 2003. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 2003 (68 FR 8620). The Department's determination was based on the finding that workers provided industrial design and engineering services and did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act.

In a letter dated February 19, 2003, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination. The petitioner alleged that Murray Engineering produced a "tangible drawing essential and integral to the making or building of a product" and that the Department was misled by the word "Service" in the company's name.

The Department denied the petitioner's request for reconsideration on March 31, 2003, stating that the engineering drawings, schematics, and electronically generated information prepared by the subject worker group were not considered production within the meaning of the Trade Act. The Department further stated that the fact that the information is generated on paper is irrelevant to worker group eligibility for TAA. The Department's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration was published in the **Federal Register** on April 15, 2003 (68 FR 18264).

By letter of April 30, 2003, the petitioner appealed the Department's denial of eligibility to apply for TAA to the USCIT, asserting that "machine drawings (plans) are an article." The petitioner asserted that the subject worker group should be eligible to apply for TAA due to imports of like or directly competitive articles and, alternatively, because they are adversely affected secondary workers.

The Department filed a motion requesting that the USCIT remand the case to the Department for further investigation, and the USCIT granted the motion.

The Department issued its Notice of Negative Determination on Remand on August 20, 2003. The Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2003 (68 FR 53395). The remand determination stated that the workers did not produce an article and were not eligible for certification as workers producing an article affected either by a shift of production or by imports, or as adversely affected secondary workers.

On May 4, 2004, the USCIT remanded the matter to the Department for further investigation, directing the Department to investigate: (1) The nature of the