

- TA-W-54,124; J.A. Dedouch Co., Ok Park, IL: January 28, 2008.
- TA-W-54,044; Temple Inland Forest Products Corp., Building Products Div., Temple Clarion MDF Plant, Shippensburg, PA: February 9, 2004.
- TA-W-53,983 & A; Archibald Candy Co., West Jackson Plant, Chicago, IL and Midway Distribution Center, Chicago, IL: January 8, 2003.
- TA-W-53,958; Motorola Operations Building, San Jose, CA: October 6, 2002.
- TA-W-53,919 & A; Senco Products, Inc., (8485 Broadwell Rd), Cincinnati, OH and (8450 Broadwell Rd), Cincinnati, OH: February 5, 2004.
- TA-W-54,063; Texas Instruments, Inc., Make-Leadframe Div., Attleboro, MA: January 16, 2003.
- TA-W-54,184 & A; Tropical Sportswear International Corp., Cutting Facility, Tampa, FL and Distribution Center, Tampa, FL: January 15, 2003.
- TA-W-54,015; Sanmina-SCI Corp., Personal and Business Computing, Plant 474, including leased workers of Manpower, Durham, NC and Plant 475, including leased workers of Manpower, Durham, NC: January 14, 2003.
- TA-W-54,054; Lincoln County Manufacturing, Inc., Fayetteville, TN: January 14, 2003.
- TA-W-54,218; Phelps Dodge Industries, Inc., Phelps Dodge Magnet Wire Div., El Paso, TX: February 6, 2003.
- TA-W-53,957; H. Warshaw & Sons, Inc., Tappahannock, VA: January 5, 2003.
- TA-W-54,067; Eaton Corp., Powertrain Controls Div., Marshall, MI: January 20, 2003.
- TA-W-54,046; Best Manufacturing Group, LLC, Estill, SC: January 15, 2003.
- TA-W-53,766; Network Elements, Manufacturing Div., Beaverton, OR: December 9, 2002.
- TA-W-53,868; Signage, Inc., Centerville, TN: December 19, 2002.
- TA-W-53,981; Marine Accessories Corp., Westland Industries, Tempe, AZ: January 6, 2003.
- TA-W-53,975; Weavexx Corp., Farmville Facility, a wholly owned subsidiary of Xerium s.A., Farmville, VA: December 19, 2002.
- TA-W-54,036; PolyOne Corp., Engineered Films, Burlington, NJ: January 13, 2003.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the months of January and February 2004. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C-5311, U.S.

Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: March 2, 2004.

**Timothy Sullivan,**

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04-5615 Filed 3-11-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-53,461]

#### Symtech, Inc., Spartanburg, SC; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On January 28, 2004, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 11, 2004 (69 FR 6698).

The Department initially denied Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) to workers of Symtech, Inc., Spartanburg, South Carolina because the workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act and are not service workers whose separations were caused importantly by a reduced demand for their services from a parent firm, a firm otherwise related to their firm by ownership, or a firm related by control.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleged that production did occur at the subject company and therefore, the service worker designation was erroneous.

The reconsideration investigation revealed that although machine assembly was done at the subject company, it was a negligible amount of total company sales during the relevant time period. The main functions of the company were the sale, distribution, and servicing of machines.

#### 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 27th day of February, 2004.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04-5608 Filed 3-11-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-53,416]

#### Wolverine Pattern and Machine, Inc., Saginaw, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of January 5, 2004, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Local Patternmakers 2839 requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on December 9, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on January 16, 2004 (69 FR 2622).

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 petition for the workers of Wolverine Pattern and Machine, Inc., Saginaw, Michigan was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm and/or through a survey of firms to which the subject firm submitted bids. In this case, the bid survey revealed that none of the respondent customer firms awarded their bids for industrial molds and tooling to foreign competitors. The subject firm did not import industrial molds and tooling in the relevant period nor did it shift production to a foreign country.

The petitioner refers to the subject firm's competitor, National Pattern, Inc.,