

for gas from section 8(g) leases in the Gulf of Mexico initiated the pilots as part of the continuing effort to follow through on the recommendations of the *Royalty-In-Kind Feasibility Study* published by MMS in 1997. Both reports have been previously released as drafts. The MMS received relatively few comments.

In Wyoming, the MMS coordinated with the State and began taking in kind and offering for sale oil from leases in the Big Horn and Powder River Basins in October 1998. The Report summarizes and analyzes the results of the first three 6-month sales. The Report includes an addendum responding to comments received concerning the indices used in the analysis.

The gas RIK pilot undertaken jointly by the State of Texas General Land Office and MMS, began in June 1999. The pilot included 13 of the 40 leases offshore Texas subject to section 8(g) of the OCS Lands Act. The Report summarizes and analyzes the results of the sales for the first 19 months—June 1999 through December 2000.

Many of the lessons learned during the Wyoming oil and the Texas 8(g) pilots have been carried over to the expansion of the gas RIK pilots to the entire Gulf of Mexico (GOM).

The internet posting and availability of the Report in hard copy are being announced by a press release as well as in this **Federal Register** notice.

Dated: March 1, 2004.

R. M. "Johnnie" Burton,

Director, Minerals Management Service.

[FR Doc. 04-5626 Filed 3-11-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1057 (Final)]

Certain Processed Hazelnuts From Turkey

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of investigation.

SUMMARY: On February 19, 2004, the Commission received notice from the Department of Commerce stating that, having received a letter from petitioners in the subject investigation (Westnut LLC, Northwest Hazelnut Co., Hazelnut Growers of Oregon, Willamette Filbert Growers, Evergreen Orchards, and Evonuk Orchards) withdrawing their petition, Commerce was terminating its antidumping investigation on certain processed hazelnuts from Turkey. Accordingly, pursuant to section

207.40(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.40(a)), the subject investigation is terminated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 19, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Reavis (202-205-3185), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

Authority: This investigation is being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.40 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.40).

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-5594 Filed 3-11-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. TA-421-5]

Uncovered Innerspring Units from China

Determination

On the basis of information developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 421(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974,¹ that uncovered innerspring units² from the

¹ 19 U.S.C. 2451(b)(1).

² For purposes of this investigation, the product subject to this investigation is uncovered innerspring units composed of a series of individual metal springs wired together and fitted to an outer wire frame, suitable for use as the innerspring component in the manufacture of innerspring mattresses. Included within this definition are innersprings typically ranging from 34 inches to 76 inches in width and 71 inches to 84 inches in length, corresponding to the sizes of adult mattresses (twin, twin long, full, full long, queen, California king, and king) and units used in smaller constructions, such as crib and youth mattresses. The subject product is properly imported under statistical reporting number 9404.29.9010 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS).

People's Republic of China are not being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause market disruption to the domestic producers of like or directly competitive products.

Background

Following receipt of a petition filed on January 6, 2004, on behalf of the American Innerspring Manufacturers (AIM),³ Memphis, TN, the Commission instituted investigation No. TA-421-5, Uncovered Innerspring Units From China, under section 421 of the Trade Act of 1974 to determine whether uncovered innerspring units from China are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause market disruption to the domestic producers of like or directly competitive products.

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigation and of the scheduling of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting a copy of the notice on the Commission's Web site (<http://www.usitc.gov>) and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** (69 FR 2002, January 13, 2004). The hearing was held on February 19, 2004, in Washington, DC and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

Issued: March 8, 2004.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-5630 Filed 3-11-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-53,084]

Eaton Corporation, Watertown, WI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of December 19, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's

Not included in the scope of the petition are "pocket" coils, which are individual coils covered by a "pocket" or "sock" of a nonwoven synthetic material and then glued together in a linear fashion.

³ Petitioning firms include Atlas Spring Manufacturing, Gardena, CA; Hickory Springs Manufacturing Co., Hickory, NC; Leggett & Platt, Carthage, MO; and Joseph Saval Spring & Wire Co., Inc., Taylor, MI.

negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 29, 2003 (68 FR 74977).

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, filed on behalf of workers at Eaton Corporation, Watertown, Wisconsin engaged in the production of printed circuit boards, was denied because criteria I.C and II.B and the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. It was revealed that printed circuit boards produced by the subject firm are used internally within the Eaton Corporation. The survey of affiliated plants which receive the vast majority of the subject firm's products revealed no imports of like or directly competitive products. The subject firm has not shifted production of printed circuit boards abroad during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that the company shifted several production lines abroad. In particular, the petitioner alleges that while the printed circuit boards are processed at the subject firm, the final assembly of arc fault circuit breaker is completed at a plant in Mexico.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. The official clarified that the automation process of production of arc fault circuit breakers was and is currently done by Eaton Corporation in Watertown, Wisconsin, while the manual assembly work has always been performed in Mexico and never in Watertown, Wisconsin. There never was a shift of arc fault circuit breaker production from the subject facility abroad.

The petitioner also alleges that there was a shift in the final assembly of Westinghouse products from the subject firm to Canada in the relevant period.

The official stated that the final assembly for the Westinghouse electronic assembly line was transferred to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1996–1997. This process stayed in Pittsburgh for approximately three years and then was moved to Calgary, Canada.

Finally, the petitioner alleges that the production of truck, which represented about one-third of the production of the Watertown facility, went to Motorola and possibly abroad.

The official reported that in 2000, the truck printed circuit board business was requested and was removed from the Watertown, Wisconsin location. Motorola was awarded the business, and manufactured this product in the USA (Texas). It was revealed that Watertown facility has the same amount of printed circuit board business as it had in 2000. Finally, the official confirmed directly that there was no shift in production from the subject firm to any facility abroad in the relevant period.

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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 25th day of February, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,
Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04–5613 Filed 3–11–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–53,323]

Franklin Electric Company, Inc., Motor Components Division, Jonesboro, IN; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application of December 24, 2003, a petitioner 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 November 18, 2003, based on the finding that imports of lead wire did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant and that

a shift in production of motors from the subject facility to Mexico has not affected employment of workers at the subject firm. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 29, 2003 (68 FR 74978).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied additional information to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation. Upon further review and contact with a company official, it was revealed that the workers at the subject facility are engaged in the production of electric motors and electric wires and they are not separately identifiable by the product line. It was also revealed that the subject firm shifted its production of electric motors to Mexico during the relevant period and is currently implementing a shift in production of electric wires to Mexico. There was a significant decline in employment during the period under investigation.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I determine that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or subdivision, and there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of like or directly competitive articles. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Franklin Electric Company, Inc., Motor Components Division, Jonesboro, Indiana who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 16, 2002 through two years from the date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 25th day of February 2004.

Elliott S. Kushner,
Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04–5610 Filed 3–11–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–53,156]

Halmode Apparel, Incorporated, a Division of Kellwood Company, Roanoke, Virginia; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On January 12, 2004, the petitioner requested administrative review of the