

requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc., Indianapolis, Indiana (subject firm). The determination was issued on August 28, 2014. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 11, 2014 (79 FR 54298). Workers at the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the production of resistance welding consumables and accessories, such as welding tips and holders.

The negative determination was based on the Department's findings that during the course of the investigation, the Department received information which establishes that BGA Management, LCC (doing business as Alliance Management) is the Court-appointed receiver for CMW International, LLC; that CMW International, LLC is the successor-in-interest to CMW International, Inc.; that the afore-mentioned entities have the same address as Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc.; that the Court-appointed receiver was authorized to sell assets, including the right to sell products under the Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc./CMW brand; and that the entity(s) selling products under the CMW brand are not successor-in-interest to either CMW International, LLC, CMW International, Inc., or Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc.

With respect to Section 222(a)(2)(B) of the Act, the Department did not receive information that Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc. shifted production of resistance welding consumables and accessories, or like or directly competitive articles, to a foreign country.

With respect to Section 222(a)(2)(A)(ii), the Department did not receive information that imports of articles like or directly competitive with the resistance welding consumables and accessories produced by Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc. increased during the relevant period.

With respect to Section 222(b)(2) of the Act, the Department did not receive information that Contacts Metals and Welding, Inc. was a Supplier to, or act as a Downstream Producer for, a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a), based on an increase in imports from, or a shift in production to, Canada or Mexico.

The request for reconsideration states "The Union has, since the negative

determination, been reaching out to secure better contact information . . . We are submitting that information so that a more comprehensive re-investigation can be conducted." The request for reconsideration also alleged that production shifted to various foreign countries including Mexico, Canada, Germany, and China. In addition, the request for reconsideration included contact information for a union representative and several former company officials to assist with the reconsideration.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of December 2014.

Michael W. Jaffe

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2014-29317 Filed 12-15-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-85,505]

Red Shield Acquisition, D/B/A Old Town Fuel and Fiber, Old Town, Maine; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated October 3, 2014, United Steelworkers, Local 4-0080 (USW) requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance, applicable to workers and former workers of Red Shield Acquisition, d/b/a Old Town Fuel and Fiber, Old Town, Maine (subject firm). The determination was signed on September 23, 2014, and the Department's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 21, 2014 (79 FR 62971). The subject firm is engaged in the production of bleached hardwood kraft pulp.

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 negative determination was based on the Department's findings that the subject firm did not shift the production of articles like or directly competitive with bleached hardwood kraft pulp to a foreign country; that imports of articles like or directly competitive with the bleached hardwood kraft pulp did not contribute importantly to the workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of the firm; and that the subject firm is not a Supplier or Downstream Producer to a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). During the investigation, the Department reviewed import data from the subject firm and its major declining customers, and within the industry.

In the request for reconsideration, USW asserts that the majority of the kraft pulp market is produced in foreign countries and that two of the subject firm's major customers use foreign-made pulp in their paper and tissue production process.

The request for reconsideration did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination. Based on these findings, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After careful 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 in Washington, DC, this 9th day of December, 2014.

Michael W. Jaffe

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2014–29313 Filed 12–15–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–85,475, TA–W–85,475A, TA–W–85,475B, et al.]

Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

TA–W–85,475

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Forest Park, Georgia.

TA–W–85,475A

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adecco, Belflex, and Job Store, Hebron, Kentucky.

TA–W–85,475B

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee.

TA–W–85,475C

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Roanoke, Virginia.

TA–W–85,475D

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Advantage Staffing, Sheldon, Iowa.

TA–W–85,475E

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adams & Garth, Chester, Virginia.

TA–W–85,475F

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland.

TA–W–85,475G

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Aerotek, Tempe, Arizona.

TA–W–85,475H

Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Independence, Missouri.

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (“Act”), 19 U.S.C. § 2273, and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on August 26, 2014, applicable to workers of Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Forest Park, Georgia (TA–

W–85,475), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adecco, Belflex, and Job Store, Hebron, Kentucky (TA–W–85,475A), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee (TA–W–85,475B), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Roanoke, Virginia (TA–W–85,475C), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Advantage Staffing, Sheldon, Iowa (TA–W–85,475D), and Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adams & Garth, Chester, Virginia (TA–W–85,475E). The Department’s notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on September 11, 2014 (79 FR 54298–54299).

At the request of a State Workforce Office, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in activities related to the production of prescription eyeglass lenses and coatings.

The subject firm confirmed that worker separations from Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland (TA–W–85,475F), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Tempe, Arizona (TA–W–85,475G) and Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Independence, Missouri (TA–W–85,475H) were attributable to the same shift in production to a foreign country that was the basis for the certification. The worker group in Tempe, Arizona (TA–W–85,475G) includes on-site leased workers from Aerotek.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–85,475 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Forest Park, Georgia (TA–W–85,475), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adecco, Belflex, and Job Store, Hebron, Kentucky (TA–W–85,475A), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee (TA–W–85,475B), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Roanoke, Virginia (TA–W–85,475C), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Advantage Staffing, Sheldon, Iowa (TA–W–85,475D), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Adams & Garth, Chester, Virginia (TA–W–85,475E), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland (TA–W–85,475F), Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., including on-site leased workers from Aerotek, Tempe, Arizona (TA–W–85,475G) and Carl Zeiss Vision, Inc., Independence, Missouri (TA–W–85,475H), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 8, 2013 through August 26, 2016, 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 in Washington, DC, this 23rd day of October 2014.

Michael W. Jaffe,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2014–29315 Filed 12–15–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Public Availability of Fiscal Year 2012 and 2013 Agency Inventories Under the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

ACTION: Notice of Public Availability of Agency Inventory of Activities that are not Inherently Governmental and of Activities that are Inherently Governmental.

SUMMARY: The Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act, Public Law 105–270, requires agencies to develop inventories each year of activities performed by their employees that are not inherently governmental functions. The FAIR Act further requires OMB to review the inventories in consultation with the agencies. Once that review is complete, agencies are required to make the list available to the public and OMB must publish a notice of public availability in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with the FAIR Act, OMB is publishing this notice to announce the availability of inventories for Fiscal Years (FY) 2012 and 2013 from the agencies listed below. These inventories identify activities that are not inherently governmental and those activities that are inherently governmental. If an agency has not yet posted its inventory on its Web site, the agency’s point of contact should be able to assist.

As provided in the FAIR Act, interested parties who disagree with the agency’s initial judgment may challenge the inclusion, or the omission, of an activity on the list of activities that are not inherently governmental within 30 working days of this Notice and, if not satisfied with this review, may appeal to a higher level within the agency.

Shaun Donovan,
Director.