

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training
Administration**

[NAFTA—06051]

**Mac Specialties Ltd, Oceanside, NY;
Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with section 250(a), subchapter D, chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on February 11, 2002, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Mac Specialties Ltd, Oceanside, New York.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of May, 2002.

Linda G. Poole,

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–14795 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA–W–41,086]

**Abbott Laboratories, Laurinburg, NC;
Notice of Revised Determination on
Reconsideration**

By application of May 1, 2002, the company 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, based on the finding that imports of medical equipment (IV units, surgical kits, trays etc.) did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant. The denial notice was signed on April 11, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 24, 2002 (67 FR 20166).

The company requested reconsideration based on a misunderstanding of the "Business Confidential Data Request Form" they

supplied the Department of Labor. The company failed to supply quantities and timing of products that are being imported back to the United States.

A review of import data supplied by the company on administrative reconsideration shows that the company began importing medical equipment "like or directly competitive" with products produced at the subject plant during the relevant period.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the new facts obtained on reconsideration, it is concluded that increased imports of medical equipment, contributed importantly to the decline in production and to the total or partial separation of workers at Abbott Laboratories, Laurinburg, North Carolina. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following revised determination:

"All workers of Abbott Laboratories, Laurinburg, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 18, 2001 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed in Washington, DC, this 31st day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment
Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–14799 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA–W–40,256]

**Lucent Technologies (Now Known as
Celestica), Columbus Works,
Columbus, OH; Notice of Revised
Determination on Reconsideration**

By letter of February 28, 2002, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 2020 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 January 31, 2002, based on the finding that imports of circuit packs did not contribute importantly to worker separations at Lucent Technologies, (now known as Celestica), Columbus Works, Columbus, Ohio. The denial

notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2002 (67 FR 6748).

The petitioner on reconsideration alleged that the company shifted production of circuit packs to Canada and China and began importing the products back to the United States during the relevant period.

A review of data supplied in the initial investigation and further clarification obtained from the company shows that a major portion of production at the subject firm was transferred to foreign sources and that greater than half of that production was imported back to the United States during the relevant period.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Lucent Technologies, (now known as Celestica), Columbus Works, Columbus, Ohio, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Lucent Technologies, (now known as Celestica), Columbus Works, Columbus, Ohio, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 10, 2000 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 30th day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment
Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–14797 Filed 6–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA–W–40,419]

**Flextronics International, Portsmouth,
NH; Notice of Negative Determination
Regarding Application for
Reconsideration**

By application received on May 1, 2002, the 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 Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire was issued on April 2, 2002, and was published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2002 (67 FR 18923).

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 investigation findings revealed that criterion (2) of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met. Plant sales and production of networking products PCBA and chassis assemblies increased from 2000 to 2001.

The request for reconsideration alleges that sales and production at the subject plant declined during the latter part of 2001. The petitioner attached various news articles to attempt to illustrate declines in sales and production during the relevant period.

The company reported increased sales and production at the subject plant in 2001 over the corresponding 2000 period. Further review of the initial investigation shows that the preponderance in the declines in employment at Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire is the direct result of plant production being shifted to a foreign source during the latter part of 2001 and those products are not being imported back to the United States during the relevant period. Thus on further analysis criterion (3) group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 also was not met. Imports did not contribute importantly to the subject plant layoffs.

The petitioner further states that the company turned down work because of it being too labor intensive, the company is restructuring their operations in the United States, Western Europe and Asia and that production will be moved to lower-cost regions such as Mexico. None of these factors are a basis for certifying the worker group at Flextronics International, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

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 31st day of May, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02-14786 Filed 6-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,610]

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, East Gadsden, AL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of April 3, 2002, the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, CLC, Local Union No. 12L 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 was signed on March 4, 2002 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2002 (67 FR 13010).

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 Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, East Gadsden, Alabama engaged in the production of passenger radial tires and light truck tires, was denied because criteria (2) was not met. Production of passenger radial tires and light truck tires at the subject plant increased from 2000 to 2001.

The request for reconsideration alleges that company wide sales of tires declined during the relevant period. The petitioner attached various news articles to illustrate declines in company sales during the relevant period.

An examination of Goodyear Tire and Rubber's 2001 *Annual Report* shows that the company's tire sales declined during the 2001 period over the corresponding 2000 period. Further examination of the 2001 *Annual Report* shows that the preponderance in the declines in company tire sales is related to lost business in foreign countries, rather than lost domestic tire sales.

A further review of aggregate U.S. imports of radial tires shows that imports declined in the year 2001 compared to 2000. Also, the company did not import articles like or directly competitive with articles produced at the subject firm.

Thus, on further analysis, criterion (3) group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 also was not met. Imports of radial tires did not contribute importantly to the subject plants layoffs. Analysis of information provided indicates that any fluctuation in corporate wide sales appears related to a global slowdown, rather than imports impacting the subject plant.

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 3rd day of June, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02-14788 Filed 6-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-40,572]

Northeast Bleach and Dye, Inc., Schuylkill Haven, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of April 15, 2002, the company, 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 March 18, 2002, based on the finding that imports of dyed yarn and fabric did not