Finally, the company official was asked to provided a detailed list of imports like or directly competitive with those produced at the Troy facility. The total volume of imports since 2001 is negligible relative to subject firm production, and thus could not have contributed importantly to layoffs at the subject firm.

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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

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

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20115 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 4510–30–P**

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,001]

Risdon-AMS USA, Inc., A Wholly-Owned Subsidiary of Crown Holdings, Including Temporary Workers of Central New Hampshire Employment, Laconia, New Hampshire; 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 June 24, 2003, applicable to workers of Risdon-AMS USA, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Crown Holdings, Laconia, New Hampshire. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 10, 2003 (68 FR 41180).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that the Department incorrectly identified the temp agency firm name. Therefore, the Department is amending the certification determination to correctly identify the temp agency firm title name to read Central New Hampshire Employment.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-52,001 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Risdon-AMS USA, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Crown Holdings,

Laconia, New Hampshire, and temporary workers of Central New Hampshire Employment producing mascara brush and cup assemblies at Risdon-AMS USA, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Crown Holdings, Laconia, New Hampshire, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 10, 2002, through June 24, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

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

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20099 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,120]

Sun Apparel of Texas, Jones Apparel of Texas Ltd, Armour Facility Print Shop, El Paso, Texas; Amended Notice of Determinations Regarding Application for Reconsideration

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Determinations Regarding Application for Reconsideration on July 1, 2003, applicable to workers of Sun Apparel of Texas, Armour Facility, El Paso, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 15, 2003 (68 FR 41847–41848).

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 jokers (waist band labels) and stickers (leg stickers used to designate size).

New information shows that Jones Apparel of Texas Ltd is the parent firm of Sun Apparel of Texas. Workers separated from employment at the subject firm had their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Jones Apparel of Texas Ltd.

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 the Print Shop working at Sun Apparel of Texas, Jones Apparel of Texas Ltd, Armour Facility, El Paso, Texas who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-51,120 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Sun Apparel of Texas, Jones Apparel of Texas Ltd, Armour Facility, Print Shop, El Paso, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 8, 2002, through July 1, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 24th day of July, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20103 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,758]

Teleflex Automotive, Inc., a Division of Teleflex, Inc., Van Wert, OH; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of June 13, 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 June 6, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on June 19, 2003 (68 FR 36846).

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 Teleflex Automotive, Inc., a division of Teleflex, Inc., Van Wert, Ohio, engaged in the production of patterns, 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 firm's major customers regarding their purchases of competitive products in 2000 through April 2003. The respondents reported no increased imports. The subject firm did not increase its reliance on imports of