(increased imports) and (a)(2)(D) (abift

	r paragraphs(a)(2)(A) (Increased imports) and (a)(2)(B) (shift in production or services to a foreign	met.	222 have not been
TA-W No.	Subject firm	Location	Impact date
72,949 73,225 73,579 73,629 73,655 73,702 74,297	velopment Division. Custom Hoists, Inc., Standex International	St. Louis, MO. Colebrook, NH. Lake Forest, CA. Hayesville, OH. Galax, VA. Huntington Beach, CA. Erie, PA. Miami, FL. Seattle, WA. McKeesport, PA.	

Determinations Terminating Investigations of Petitions for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The investigation revealed that the

After notice of the petitions was published in the **Federal Register** and

on the Department's Web site, as required by Section 221 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 2271), the Department initiated investigations of these petitions. The following determinations terminating investigations were issued because the petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn.

country) of costion 222 have not been

TA-W No.	Subject firm	Location	Impact date
74,376 74,421	Fairfield Chair Company, Plant #1	Dayton, OH. Hermitage, PA. Lenoir, NC. Charleston, SC.	

The following determinations terminating investigations were issued in cases where these petitions were not filed in accordance with the requirements of 29 CFR 90.11. Every petition filed by workers must be signed

by at least three individuals of the petitioning worker group. Petitioners separated more than one year prior to the date of the petition cannot be covered under a certification of a petition under Section 223(b), and therefore, may not be part of a petitioning worker group. For one or more of these reasons, these petitions were deemed invalid.

TA-W No.	Subject firm	Location	Impact date
73,890	Pioneer Press, Ltd	Kaukauna, WI.	

The following determinations terminating investigations were issued because the petitioning groups of

workers are covered by active certifications. Consequently, further investigation in these cases would serve

no purpose since the petitioning group of workers cannot be covered by more than one certification at a time.

TA-W No.	Subject firm	Location	Impact date
74,153	Freescale Semiconductor, Inc., Quality Division, Leased Workers from Man-Power.	Austin, TX.	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Runnemede, NJ. North Canton, OH.	

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the period of August 2, 2010 through August 6, 2010. Copies of these determinations may be requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Requests may be submitted by fax, courier services, or mail to FOIA Disclosure Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance (ETA), U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 or tofoiarequest@dol.gov. These determinations also are available on the Department's Web site at http://www.doleta.gov/tradeact under the searchable listing of determinations.

Date: August 11, 2010.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–20790 Filed 8–20–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under Section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to Section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than September 2, 2010.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than September 2, 2010.

Copies of these petitions may be requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Requests may be submitted by fax, courier services, or mail, to FOIA Disclosure Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance (ETA), U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 or to foiarequest@dol.gov.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of August 2010.

Michael Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

APPENDIX
[TAA petitions instituted between 8/2/10 and 8/6/10]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
74452	Leisure Arts (State/One-Stop)	Little Rock, AR	08/02/10	07/30/10
74453	REA Magnet Wire Company, Inc. (Workers)	Osceola, AR	08/02/10	07/26/10
74454	LSI Incorporated (Workers)	Fort Collins, CO	08/02/10	07/22/10
74455	Uniboard Fostoria, Incorporated (Company)	Fostoria, OH	08/02/10	07/26/10
74456	Global Recruiters of Boulder (Company)	Boulder, CO	08/02/10	07/19/10
74457	Leach International Esterline Corporation (State/One-Stop)	Buena Park, CA	08/02/10	07/22/10
74458	Smart-Sox, Incorporated (Company)	Thomasville, NC	08/02/10	07/29/10
74459	The Sun News/McClatchy Company (State/One-Stop)	Myrtle Beach, SC	08/02/10	07/28/10
74460	Sing Fai, Inc. (Workers)	San Francisco, CA	08/03/10	07/24/10
74461	Providence Chain Co. (Workers)	Providence, RÍ	08/03/10	07/30/10
74462	US Airways, Inc. (Worker)	Columbus, OH	08/04/10	07/30/10
74463	Kimble Chase Life Science and Research Products, LLC (Company).	Vineland, NJ	08/04/10	07/14/10
74464	BreconRidge Manufacturing Solutions (Company)	Ogdensburg, NY	08/04/10	07/29/10
74465	Harman Consumer, Inc. (Company)	Northridge, CA	08/04/10	08/02/10
74466	Hewlett Packard (Company)	Palo Alto, CA	08/04/10	06/22/10
74467	Zach System Corporation (Workers)	La Porte, TX	08/04/10	08/03/10
74468	Cameron Compression Systems (Union)	Buffalo, NY	08/04/10	04/20/10
74469	Deloitte Services, LP (State/One-Stop)	Boston, MA	08/04/10	07/29/10
74470	Standard Microsystems Corporation (SMSC) (State/One-Stop).	Hauppaugue, NY	08/04/10	08/02/10
74471	Alumax Service Center (Company)	Riverside, MO	08/04/10	07/15/10
74472	EMC Corporation (State)	Durham, NC	08/04/10	07/30/10
74473	EMC Corporation (State)	Alexandria, VA	08/05/10	07/30/10
74474	EMC Corporation (1) (State/One-Stop)	Berkeley Heights, NJ	08/05/10	07/30/10
74475	EMC Corporation (2) (State/One-Stop)	Berkeley Heights, NJ	08/05/10	07/30/10
74476	EMC Corporation (1) (State/One-Stop)	Colorado Springs, CO	08/05/10	07/30/10
74477	EMC Corporation (2) (State/One-Stop)	Colorado Springs, CO	08/05/10	07/30/10
74478	EMC Corporation (State/One-Stop)	Duluth, GA	08/05/10	07/30/10
74479	EMC Corporation (State/One-Stop)	Dallas, TX	08/05/10	07/30/10
74480	EMC Corporation (State/One-Stop)	White Plains, NY	08/05/10	07/30/10
74481	Diversey, Inc. (Company)	Sturtevant, WI	08/06/10	08/04/10
74482	Airolite, LLC (Company)	Marietta, OH	08/06/10	07/09/10
74483	Wood Group GTS (State/One-Stop)	East Windsor, CT	08/06/10	08/03/10
74484	New York Wire (Company)	Walterboro, SC	08/06/10	08/02/10
74485	Akzo Nobel Nonstick Coatings (Company)	Des Plaines, IL	08/06/10	07/27/10
74486	Precision Dormer, LLC (Company)	Crystal Lake, IL	08/06/10	08/03/10
74487	Aloecorp, Inc. (Company)	Lyford, TX	08/06/10	08/04/10
74488	Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC) (State/One-Stop)	Newark, DE	08/06/10	07/30/10
74489	Warner Chilcott Pharmaceuticals (Workers)	Norwich, NY	08/06/10	08/06/10
74490	Fermer Precision, Inc. (Company)	Ilion, NY	08/06/10	07/23/10
74491	Acme Electric (Company)	Lumberton, NC	08/06/10	07/28/10
74492	Rocky III Investments, LLC (State/One-Stop)	Grand Junction, CO	08/06/10	08/02/10
74493	Accenture, LLC (Workers)	Wilmington, DE	08/06/10	07/26/10
74494	Dyno Nobel, Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Ulster Park, NY	08/06/10	07/28/10
74495	General Electric Grove City (Workers)	Grove City, PA	08/06/10	08/03/10
	223.23.2		33, 33, 10	

[FR Doc. 2010–20789 Filed 8–20–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-64,725]

Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc., Corporate Office, Medford, WI; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand

On February 9, 2010, the U.S. Court of International Trade (USCIT) remanded to the U.S. Department of Labor (Department) for further review, Former Employees of Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc. v. United States, Court No. 09–00377.

On December 17, 2008, former workers of Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc. (subject firm) filed a petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) on behalf of workers of Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc., Corporate Office, Medford, Wisconsin (subject facility).

The initial investigation revealed that, during the period under investigation, the workers at the subject facility (subject worker group) supported the production of doors and/or windows by providing administrative support functions to various subject firm manufacturing facilities and that there had been a significant number or proportion of workers at the subject facility that were totally or partially separated from employment. However, it was determined that imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject facility and that the subject firm did not shift production to a foreign country. A survey of a sample of the subject firm's declining domestic customers revealed negligible imports of products like or directly competitive with those produced by workers at the subject firm.

The Department issued a negative determination regarding the subject worker group's eligibility to apply for TAA and ATAA on April 29, 2009. The Department's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 18, 2009 (74 FR 23214).

By application dated May 26, 2009, the petitioning workers requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination. To support the claim that the subject worker group was import impacted, the petitioners provided additional information regarding the products

manufactured at the subject firm and the worker separations occurring throughout all subject firm locations. The petitioners also provided information pertaining to a competitor of the subject firm whose workers had been certified eligible to apply for TAA.

The Department issued a Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration on June 2, 2009. The Department's Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 18, 2009 (74 FR 28956).

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department obtained additional information from the subject firm regarding the petitioners' claims. The Department also surveyed additional declining customers regarding their purchases of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm. The reconsideration investigation did not reveal information sufficient to reverse the initial negative determination.

Based on the findings of the reconsideration investigation, the Department concluded that customer imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by workers at the subject firm did not contribute importantly to worker separations. The Department issued a Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration on July 14, 2009. The Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 30, 2009 (74 FR 38048).

The petitioners thereupon filed a complaint to the USCIT. In the complaint to the USCIT, dated January 19, 2010, the Plaintiffs alleged that workers at the subject facility were impacted by increased customer imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm. The Plaintiffs also requested the Department to investigate all the subject firm locations and product lines manufactured at the production facilities.

On January 19, 2010, Plaintiffs filed a motion to supplement the administrative record before the USCIT. Plaintiffs' motion included additional evidence not considered in Labor's investigation of the subject workers' petition for TAA benefits, including, in particular, information pertaining to competitors of the subject firm whose workers had been certified eligible to apply for TAA and who had overlapping customers with the subject firm. Since a number of these customers had not been contacted in the original investigation, a further review of this information was deemed necessary.

Based on the new information submitted, the Department requested that the USCIT remand the case to the Department to conduct a further investigation. On February 9, 2010, the USCIT granted this request.

For a worker group to be certified for TAA based on increased imports, all of the following must be satisfied:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

B. The sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely; and

C. Increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision.

During the remand investigation, the Department obtained information from the subject firm and solicited input from the Plaintiffs. The Department also conducted a more extensive sample customer survey to determine whether or not there were increased customer imports in the relevant period of articles like or directly competitive with doors and/or windows produced at the subject firm and, if so, whether the increased imports contributed importantly to worker group separations.

The expanded sample customer survey conducted during the remand investigation revealed that the surveyed customer purchases from the subject firm declined while imports of doors and/or windows or articles like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm increased in the relevant period. The Department surveyed a significant proportion of the subject firm's declining customers regarding import purchases of doors and/or windows in 2007 and 2008, including overlapping customer with competitors identified by petitioners for the first time in their USCIT complaint. Overall, the customers increased import purchases in the period under investigation relative to purchases made from the subject firm.

Based on the findings of the remand investigation, the Department determines that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with doors and/or windows produced by the subject firm contributed importantly to the subject workers' separation and to the decline in subject firm sales and production.

In accordance with Section 246 the Trade Act of 1974 (26 USC 2813), as amended, the Department herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to