totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 17, 2009 through June 26, 2011, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on June 26, 2009 through June 26, 2011, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of July 2009.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–16603 Filed 7–13–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,086]

Ford Motor Company Product Development and Engineering Center Including On-Site Leased Workers From Roush Management LLC, Rapid Global Business Solutions, Inc. and TAC Automotive, Dearborn, MI; Amended Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration on August 8, 2007. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on August 20, 2007 (72 FR 46515–46516). The Revised Determination on Reconsideration was amended on January 30, 2009 to include on-site leased workers from Roush Management LLC. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2009 (74 FR 7269).

At the request of a petitioner, the Department reviewed the Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration for workers of the subject firm. The workers are in direct support of production of numerous production assembly plants of Ford Motor Company. All of these production facilities were certified eligible for adjustment assistance during April through December 2006.

New information shows that workers leased workers from Rapid Global Business Solutions, Inc., and TAC Automotive were employed on-site at the Dearborn, Michigan location of Ford Motor Company, Product Development Center. The Department has determined that these workers were sufficiently under the control of the subject firm to be considered leased workers.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this revised determination to include workers leased from Rapid Global Business Solutions, Inc., and TAC Automotive working on-site at the Dearborn, Michigan location of the subject firm.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers employed at Ford Motor Company, Product Development and Engineering Center, Dearborn, Michigan who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–60,086 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Ford Motor Company, Product Development and Engineering Center, including on-site leased workers from Roush Management LLC, Rapid Global Business Solutions, Inc., and TAC Automotive, Dearborn, Michigan, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 14, 2005, through August 8, 2009, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of July 2009.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E9–16604 Filed 7–13–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–65,739]

EOS Airlines Incorporated, Purchase, NY; Notice of Negative Determination; Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated May 18, 2009, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on April 14, 2009 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 2009 (74 FR 19996).

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department for the workers of Eos Airline Incorporated, Purchase, New York was based on the findings that the worker group did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm provided air transportation services to customers. The investigation further revealed that no production of article(s) occurred within the firm or appropriate subdivision during the relevant period.

The petitioner in the request for reconsideration contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of the work performed by the workers of the subject firm. The petitioner states that the workers of the subject firm produced an article in the form of ''Available Seat Mile''. The petitioner seems to allege that the pilots produced Seat Miles while transporting customers to their destination.

The investigation revealed that during the relevant period, the workers of Eos Airlines Incorporated, Purchase, New York provided air transportation services to customers. Specifically, according to the company official, the workers of the subject firm were pilots who provided air services between the United States and Europe.

These functions, as described above, are not considered production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act. While the provision of services results in providing the customers with the Available Seat Mile, which is used in measuring the productivity of an airline, the Seat Mile is incidental to the provision of these services. No production took place at the subject facility, nor did the workers support production of an article at any domestic location during the relevant period.

The petitioner also states that the workers would have been eligible for TAA under the new Trade Act if they filed the petition in May 2009. The petitioner seems to allege that the workers of the subject firm should be evaluated using new eligibility criteria and receive a certification for TAA under the new law, even though they filed a petition under the old Trade Act before the new provision went into effect.