Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA, namely the worker separations must be caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article and who are currently under certification for TAA.

In conclusion, the workers at the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act 1974.

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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 3rd day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4281 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,605]

Jacksonville Sewing Center, Madisonville, TN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 22, 2003 in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of the workers of Jackson Sewing Center, Madisonville, Tennessee.

The Department issued a negative determination applicable to the petitioning group of workers on December 4, 2002 (TA–W–42,256). No new information or change in circumstances is evident which would result in a reversal of the Department's previous determination. Consequently, further investigation would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of January, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4276 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–42,234]

Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on December 4, 2002, 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 Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois, was signed on August 26, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002 (67 FR 57456).

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 Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois engaged in activities related to the repair and rebuilding of underground coal mining equipment for unrelated producers. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner appears to claim that layoffs at Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois, were the result of mining machine parts arriving from Mexico.

As the subject firm does not produce original parts, but repairs existing ones, the function of subject firm workers is not considered production; thus, the workers do not produce an article with the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974.

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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4288 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41,837]

Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, MN; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on October 2, 2002, petitioners 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 Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota was signed on September 10, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 27, 2002 (67 FR 61160).

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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, engaged in activities related to screw and precision machine parts, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act was not met. The contributed importantly test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm. Results of the survey revealed that customers did not increase their imports of competitive products during the relevant period. The subject firm did not

import screw and precision machine parts during the relevant period. A domestic shift in production was cited as the cause of layoffs.

In requesting reconsideration, the petitioner(s) alleged that a company official had cited overseas competition as a factor in causing the layoffs at the Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, plant.

On further review, including contact with a company official, it was confirmed that the preponderance in sales and employment declines during the relevant period were the direct result of a domestic shift in production to other company facilities possessing excess capacity. The facilities did not produce products like or directly competitive with what the subject plant produced prior to the shift in production. Further, it was confirmed that the company's customer base did not decline during 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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 6th day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4284 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41,695]

P.C.C. Airfoils, Inc., Minerva, OH; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on September 18, 2002, petitioners 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 P.C.C. Airfoils, Inc., Minerva, Ohio, was signed on August 26, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002 (67 FR 57455).

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 P.C.C. Airfoils, Inc., Minerva, Ohio, engaged in activities related to blades and vanes for aerospace and land based turbo engines, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act was not met. The contributed importantly test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm. Results of the survey revealed that customers did not increase their imports of competitive products during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import blades and vanes for aerospace and land based turbo engines during the relevant period. A domestic shift in production was cited as the cause of layoffs.

In requesting reconsideration, the petitioner(s) alleged that production equipment had been moved from the subject facility to an offshore facility. The petitioners further allege that company officials told them that their production work was shifting to this facility.

Upon contact with a company official, it was confirmed that the production equipment that was moved was shipped to the domestic facility cited in the original investigation. Further, it was confirmed that all production work that was shifted from the subject facility was transferred to this same domestic facility.

The petitioners also appear to claim that the company has purchased duplicate tooling for a foreign facility for the purpose of producing products like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm.

Upon further review, it was revealed that the foreign facility mentioned does not produce products like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm.

Finally, the petitioners state that employees had been told by company officials that the ''finishing department will never return to Minerva''.

Although the petitioners' claim in this instance may be correct, it is irrelevant, as it has already been established that production of like or directly competitive products shifted to a domestic facility. No plant production shifted to a foreign facility.

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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 10th day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4282 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,602]

Porcelain Products Company, Macomb, IL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 17, 2003 in response to a worker petition filed by the United Steel Workers of America, Local 86G on behalf of workers of Porcelain Products Company, Macomb, Illinois.

The petitioning group of workers is already covered by an earlier petition filed on January 7, 2003 (TA–W–50,515) that is the subject of an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of January, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4275 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P