DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–52,025]

Dynamco, Inc., Roper Pump Company, Roper Industries, Inc., McKinney, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on July 15, 2003, applicable to workers of Dynamco, Roper Pump Company, McKinney, Texas. The notice will be published soon in the **Federal Register**.

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of pneumatic valves and components.

New information shows that Roper Industries, Inc. is the parent firm of Dynamco, Inc. Workers separated from employment at the subject firm had their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Roper Industries, Inc.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to properly reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Dynamco, Inc., Roper Pump Company, Roper Industries, Inc., McKinney, Texas who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–52,025 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Dynamco, Inc., Roper Pump Company, Roper Industries, Inc., McKinney, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 11, 2002, through July 15, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of July, 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20098 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–52,062]

Fishing Vessel (F/V) Juanderer, Elfin Cove, AK; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on June 17, 2003, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Fishing Vessel (F/V) Juanderer, Elfin Cove, Alaska.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. In order to establish a valid worker group, there must be at least three full-time workers employed at some point during the period under investigation. Workers of the group subject to this investigation did not meet this threshold level of employment. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 28th day of July, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20107 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,876]

Mechanical Products Company, LLC, Aerospace Division, Jackson, Michigan; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of May 27, 2003, the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Region 1C and Local Union 1330, 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 April 11, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 1, 2003 (68 FR 23322).

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 Mechanical Products Company, LLC, Aerospace Division, Jackson, Michigan was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, was not met. The ''contributed importantly'' test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imported breakers for the aerospace industry. The company did not import breakers for the aerospace industry in the relevant period.

The union asserts that, in addition to producing circuit breakers for the aerospace industry, the subject firm also produced circuit breakers for other commercial purposes, specifically in the ''1600'' and ''2000'' series.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. The official stated that, from the end of 2001 and into 2002, the subject facility briefly did some production of the 1600 series circuit breakers while the firm was in the process of shifting this production from an affiliate in Maryland to foreign sources; however, subject firm production for series 1600 circuit breakers was negligible in relation to overall plant production and no layoffs resulted from this production cessation in Jackson. The official further stated that there had been some ''rework'' done on series 2000 circuit breakers shipped from a foreign facility to Jackson; again, however, this work constituted a negligible portion of plant production. Finally, the company official clarified that subject firm layoffs were entirely attributable to the sale of the company's Aerospace Division to another company that subsequently moved production to an existing facility in Sarasota, Florida.

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 29th day of July, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20104 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,706]

Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Including Temporary Workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen, Portland, Oregon; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on May 9, 2003, applicable to workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33197).

At the request of the petitioners, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information provided by the company shows that temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen were employed at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works to produce slabs and hot-rolled steel plate at the Portland, Oregon location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending the certification to include temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen employed at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–50,706 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon, and temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen engaged in employment related to the production of slabs and hot-rolled steel plate working at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 27, 2002, through May 9, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

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

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20105 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,730]

PPG Industries, Inc., Automotive Coating Division, Troy, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application post marked on April 17, 2003, 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 was signed on March 26, 2003 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 7, 2003 (68 FR 16833).

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 PPG Industries, Inc., Automotive Coating Division, Troy, Michigan engaged in the production of pretreatment and specialty products, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The ''contributed importantly'' test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The Department conducted a survey of the subject company's major customers regarding their purchases of pretreatment and specialty products. The survey revealed that none of the customers increased their import purchases of pretreatment and specialty products during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that the company shifted production to a company affiliate in Mexico. To support this, the petitioner provides what are described as ''ship histories'' dating back to 1997, alleging that these documents indicate products that were sent from the subject firm to the facility in Mexico. In addition, the petitioner indicates that production at the Mexican facility was ''formulated and produced'' at the Troy facility, and that the Troy facility ''supplemented'' the inventory at the Mexican facility.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. Concerning the production conducted at the Mexican affiliate, the official confirmed that the Technical Division at the Troy facility had developed products that were later produced at the Mexican facility. The official also confirmed that there was similar production conducted at both facilities; however, the Mexican facility has exclusively served a foreign customer base with no overlap from the subject firm's customer base. As a result, there is no indication of a shift in production in this instance. In regard to the allegation that the Troy facility supplemented the inventory of the Mexican affiliate, a fact of this nature does not in and of itself provide proof of a shift in production. Further, when questioned on the issue of shipments from the subject firm to the Mexican affiliate, a company official stated that, having reviewed company invoices of shipments from the subject firm in the relevant period (specifically, 2001 and 2002), it was revealed that the Troy facility shipped a negligible amount of products to the Mexican affiliate. Finally, the official confirmed directly that there had not been a shift in production from the subject firm to the Mexican affiliate in the relevant period.

The petitioner also alleges that there was a shift in production from the subject firm to Canada in the relevant period.

In the initial investigation, a shift in production to Canada was acknowledged; however the shift was not considered significant. In the investigation pursuant to the reconsideration, the company official indicated that the shift in production to Canada represented a negligible portion of production at the subject plant, and was not projected to increase.

The petitioner further alleges that a specific product (Rinse Conditioner GL) was shifted to Canada.

The company official indicated that this product was temporarily shifted to Canada while the machinery in Euclid, Ohio was being set up. However, this production, in tandem with all other production shifted to Canada, was not considered significant.