

May 4, 2009 e-mail obtained during the investigation of WEATHER SHIELD I that contained subject firm sales figures for calendar year 2008. AAR 143. By comparing the sales data from WEATHER SHIELD I with the sales data from WEATHER SHIELD II, the Department was able to ascertain that subject firm sales declined during 2009 from 2008 levels.

Based on information obtained from the afore-mentioned WEATHER SHIELD I material (IR [AAR 145], NPQ [AAR 22, 122], CDRs [AAR 127–142], and the May 4, 2009 e-mail [AAR 143]), the Department determined that Section 222(a)(2)(A)(i) had been met and continued its investigation to determine whether Section 222(a)(2)(A)(ii) was met.

The Department determined that, for the relevant period of WEATHER SHIELD II, unlike the earlier relevant period for the WEATHER SHIELD I investigation, the requirements of Section 222(a)(2)(A)(ii) were not met, based on its review of material from the WEATHER SHIELD I investigation, as follows.

The Department considered the complete customer list obtained during WEATHER SHIELD I (AAR 209) and the results of the customer surveys conducted during the remand investigation of WEATHER SHIELD I. AAR 149–208.

The Department used the customer list provided during the WEATHER SHIELD I remand investigation (AAR 209) to conduct the customer survey in WEATHER SHIELD II. AAR 29–48. The Department surveyed only those customers with sales data for the year 2009, the relevant time period for the WEATHER SHIELD II investigation. AAR 29–48, 62–63. The WEATHER SHIELD II customers surveyed consisted of 16% of subject firm sales in 2008 and 13% of subject firm sales in 2009. AAR 53–56, 62–63.

The WEATHER SHIELD II investigation customer survey responses were combined with the responses of the same customers received during the WEATHER SHIELD I remand investigation for year 2008 to conduct a comparative analysis. AAR 53–56, 61–63. As noted above, the Department had conducted an expansive sample customer survey in WEATHER SHIELD I approximately three months before administering the customer survey for WEATHER SHIELD II. The analysis of overall subject firm sales, purchases made by the surveyed customers, and direct and indirect imports, did not reveal increased imports, per 29 CFR 90.2, by the surveyed customers. AAR 53–56, 61–63.

Further, as noted in the initial WEATHER SHIELD II determination, U.S. aggregate imports of metal/wood doors and windows (and like or directly competitive articles) declined from 2008 to 2009. AAR 57–58. As noted above, most of the customers on the customer list that was submitted in WEATHER SHIELD I (AAR 209) constituted a very small portion of the subject firm's sales; therefore, the results of an analysis of aggregate data of like or directly competitive articles is relevant because it is representative of the import activity of the subject firm's customer base during the relevant period of WEATHER SHIELD II.

The Department's determination is not inconsistent with the four affirmative TAA decisions attached to Plaintiffs' Motion to Supplement the Administrative Record before the USCIT in Court No. 10–00299. Workers of Springs Window Fashions, LLC (TA–W–73,575) and Simpson Door Company (TA–W–65,585) were certified as eligible to apply for TAA based in part on the investigative findings that Criterion 2 was met because their respective companies shifted production of window coverings and components, and solid wood stile and rail doors to Mexico and Canada, respectively, during the relevant periods of those investigations. Workers of Jeld-Wen Premium Doors (TA–W–71,644) and Woodgrain Millworks, Inc. (TA–W–65,461), were certified as eligible to apply for TAA based in part on the investigative findings that Criterion 2 was met because of increased imports or increased reliance on imported articles like or directly competitive with the articles produced by those companies. Those certifications involved different relevant periods.

Because increased imports is defined by 29 CFR 90.2, and the date of the petition determines the relevant period and the representative base period, facts that were the basis for certifications involving earlier-filed petitions cannot be the basis for a certification in WEATHER SHIELD II, just as the certification in WEATHER SHIELD I cannot be the basis for a certification in WEATHER SHIELD II.

Additionally, with respect to Section 222(c) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(c), the investigation revealed that the workers could not be certified as adversely affected secondary workers because the subject firm did not produce an article or supply a service that was used by a firm with TAA-certified workers in the production of an article or supply of a service that was the basis for TAA certification.

Finally, the group eligibility requirements under Section 222(f) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(f), have not been met because the subject firm has not been identified by name in an affirmative finding of injury by the International Trade Commission.

Based on the afore-mentioned findings, the Department determined that the subject worker group was not eligible to apply for TAA.

## Conclusion

After careful review of material consisting of the complete administrative record, I determine that workers of Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc., Corporate Office, Medford, Wisconsin, who supply corporate office support services for metal/wood windows and doors, are denied eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273.

Signed in Washington, DC on this 3rd day of June, 2011.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2011–14818 Filed 6–14–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–71,572; TA–W–71,572A; TA–W–71,572B; TA–W–71,572C]

### Amended Revised Determination on Reconsideration

TA–W–71,572

SEVERSTAL WHEELING, INC., A  
SUBSIDIARY OF SEVERSTAL NORTH  
AMERICA, INC., CURRENTLY KNOWN  
AS RG STEEL WHEELING, LLC,  
MARTINS FERRY, OHIO

TA–W–71,572A

SEVERSTAL WHEELING, INC., A  
SUBSIDIARY OF SEVERSTAL NORTH  
AMERICA, INC., CURRENTLY KNOWN  
AS RG STEEL WHEELING, LLC,  
YORKVILLE, OHIO

TA–W–71,572B

SEVERSTAL WHEELING, INC., A  
SUBSIDIARY OF SEVERSTAL NORTH  
AMERICA, INC., CURRENTLY KNOWN  
AS RG STEEL WHEELING, LLC, MINGO  
JUNCTION, OHIO

TA–W–71,572C

SEVERSTAL WHEELING, INC., A  
SUBSIDIARY OF SEVERSTAL NORTH  
AMERICA, INC., CURRENTLY KNOWN  
AS RG STEEL WHEELING, LLC,  
STEUBENVILLE, OHIO

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“Act”), 19 U.S.C. 2273, the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Revised

Determination on Reconsideration on May 6, 2011, applicable to workers of Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., Martins Ferry, Ohio; Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., Yorkville, Ohio (TA-W-71,572A); Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., Mingo Junction, Ohio (TA-W-71,572B); and Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., Steubenville, Ohio (TA-W-71,572C). The workers produce a variety of steel coils. The Revised Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 20, 2011 (76 FR 29276–29277).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that in March 2011, RG Steel, LLC, a subsidiary of The Renco Group purchased all of the stocks of Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc. The Martins Ferry, Ohio, Yorkville, Ohio, Mingo Junction, Ohio and Steubenville, Ohio locations of Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., is currently known as RG Steel Wheeling, LLC. Workers separated from employment at the above mentioned locations of the subject firm have their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI)

tax account under the name RG Steel Wheeling, LLC.

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

The intent of the Department's Revised Determination on Reconsideration is to include all workers of the subject firm who were adversely affected by increased imports of steel coils.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-71,572, TA-W-71,572A, TA-W-71,572B, and TA-W-71,572C are hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., currently known as RG Steel Wheeling, LLC, Martins Ferry, Ohio (TA-W-71,572); Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., currently known as RG Steel Wheeling, LLC, Yorkville, Ohio (TA-W-71,572A); Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., currently known as RG Steel Wheeling, LLC, Mingo Junction, Ohio (TA-W-71,572B); and Severstal Wheeling, Inc., a subsidiary of Severstal North America, Inc., currently known as RG Steel Wheeling, LLC, Steubenville, Ohio (TA-W-71,572C), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 17, 2008, through May 6, 2013, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on the date of certification through two years from the date of certification, 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 6th day of June 2011.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2011-14817 Filed 6-14-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

[MCC 11-05]

### Notice of Quarterly Report (January 1, 2011–March 31, 2011)

**AGENCY:** Millennium Challenge Corporation.

**SUMMARY:** The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is reporting for the quarter January 1, 2011 through March 31, 2011, on assistance provided under section 605 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7701 *et seq.*), as amended (the Act), and on transfers or allocations of funds to other Federal agencies under section 619(b) of the Act. The following report will be made available to the public by publication in the **Federal Register** and on the Internet Web site of the MCC (<http://www.mcc.gov>) in accordance with section 612(b) of the Act.

## ASSISTANCE PROVIDED UNDER SECTION 605

Projects	Obligated	Objectives	Cumulative expenditures	Measures
Country: Madagascar Year: 2011 Quarter 2 Total Obligation: \$87,998,166				
Entity to which the assistance is provided: MCA Madagascar Total Quarterly Expenditures <sup>1</sup> : \$0				
Land Tenure Project .....	\$30,123,098	Increase Land Titling and Security.	\$29,304,770	Area secured with land certificates or titles in the Zones. Legal and regulatory reforms adopted. Number of land documents inventoried in the Zones and Antananarivo. Number of land documents restored in the Zones and Antananarivo. Number of land documents digitized in the Zones and Antananarivo. Average time for Land Services Offices to issue a duplicate copy of a title. Average cost to a user to obtain a duplicate copy of a title from the Land Services Offices. Number of land certificates delivered in the Zones during the period. Number of new guichets fonciers operating in the Zones. The 256 Plan Local d'Occupation Foncier-Local Plan of Land Occupation (PLOFs) are completed.
Financial Sector Reform Project.	\$25,705,099	Increase Competition in the Financial Sector.	\$23,535,781	Volume of funds processed annually by the national payment system. Number of accountants and financial experts registered to become CPA. Number of Central Bank branches capable of accepting auction tenders.