

negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 29, 2003 (68 FR 74977).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Eaton Corporation, Watertown, Wisconsin engaged in the production of printed circuit boards, was denied because criteria I.C and II.B and the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, were not met. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. It was revealed that printed circuit boards produced by the subject firm are used internally within the Eaton Corporation. The survey of affiliated plants which receive the vast majority of the subject firm's products revealed no imports of like or directly competitive products. The subject firm has not shifted production of printed circuit boards abroad during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that the company shifted several production lines abroad. In particular, the petitioner alleges that while the printed circuit boards are processed at the subject firm, the final assembly of arc fault circuit breaker is completed at a plant in Mexico.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. The official clarified that the automation process of production of arc fault circuit breakers was and is currently done by Eaton Corporation in Watertown, Wisconsin, while the manual assembly work has always been performed in Mexico and never in Watertown, Wisconsin. There never was a shift of arc fault circuit breaker production from the subject facility abroad.

The petitioner also alleges that there was a shift in the final assembly of Westinghouse products from the subject firm to Canada in the relevant period.

The official stated that the final assembly for the Westinghouse electronic assembly line was transferred to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1996–1997. This process stayed in Pittsburgh for approximately three years and then was moved to Calgary, Canada.

Finally, the petitioner alleges that the production of truck, which represented about one-third of the production of the Watertown facility, went to Motorola and possibly abroad.

The official reported that in 2000, the truck printed circuit board business was requested and was removed from the Watertown, Wisconsin location. Motorola was awarded the business, and manufactured this product in the USA (Texas). It was revealed that Watertown facility has the same amount of printed circuit board business as it had in 2000. Finally, the official confirmed directly that there was no shift in production from the subject firm to any facility abroad in the relevant period.

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 25th day of February, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04–5613 Filed 3–11–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–53,323]

Franklin Electric Company, Inc., Motor Components Division, Jonesboro, IN; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By application of December 24, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on November 18, 2003, based on the finding that imports of lead wire did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant and that

a shift in production of motors from the subject facility to Mexico has not affected employment of workers at the subject firm. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 29, 2003 (68 FR 74978).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied additional information to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation. Upon further review and contact with a company official, it was revealed that the workers at the subject facility are engaged in the production of electric motors and electric wires and they are not separately identifiable by the product line. It was also revealed that the subject firm shifted its production of electric motors to Mexico during the relevant period and is currently implementing a shift in production of electric wires to Mexico. There was a significant decline in employment during the period under investigation.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I determine that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or subdivision, and there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of like or directly competitive articles. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Franklin Electric Company, Inc., Motor Components Division, Jonesboro, Indiana who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 16, 2002 through two years from the date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 25th day of February 2004.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 04–5610 Filed 3–11–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–53,156]

Halmode Apparel, Incorporated, a Division of Kellwood Company, Roanoke, Virginia; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On January 12, 2004, the petitioner requested administrative review of the