Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of July, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20104 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,706]

Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Including Temporary Workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen, Portland, Oregon; 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 May 9, 2003, applicable to workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33197).

At the request of the petitioners, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information provided by the company shows that temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen were employed at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works to produce slabs and hot-rolled steel plate at the Portland, Oregon location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending the certification to include temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen employed at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–50,706 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon, and temporary workers of Madden Industrial Craftsmen engaged in employment related to the production of slabs and hot-rolled steel plate working at Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., Portland Steel Works, Portland, Oregon, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 27, 2002, through May 9, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 25th day of July, 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–20105 Filed 8–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,730]

PPG Industries, Inc., Automotive Coating Division, Troy, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application post marked on April 17, 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 March 26, 2003 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 7, 2003 (68 FR 16833).

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 PPG Industries, Inc., Automotive Coating Division, Troy, Michigan engaged in the production of pretreatment and specialty products, 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 company's major customers regarding their purchases of pretreatment and specialty products. The survey revealed that none of the customers increased their import purchases of pretreatment and specialty products during the relevant period.

The petitioner alleges that the company shifted production to a company affiliate in Mexico. To support this, the petitioner provides what are described as ''ship histories'' dating back to 1997, alleging that these documents indicate products that were sent from the subject firm to the facility in Mexico. In addition, the petitioner indicates that production at the Mexican facility was ''formulated and produced'' at the Troy facility, and that the Troy facility ''supplemented'' the inventory at the Mexican facility.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. Concerning the production conducted at the Mexican affiliate, the official confirmed that the Technical Division at the Troy facility had developed products that were later produced at the Mexican facility. The official also confirmed that there was similar production conducted at both facilities; however, the Mexican facility has exclusively served a foreign customer base with no overlap from the subject firm's customer base. As a result, there is no indication of a shift in production in this instance. In regard to the allegation that the Troy facility supplemented the inventory of the Mexican affiliate, a fact of this nature does not in and of itself provide proof of a shift in production. Further, when questioned on the issue of shipments from the subject firm to the Mexican affiliate, a company official stated that, having reviewed company invoices of shipments from the subject firm in the relevant period (specifically, 2001 and 2002), it was revealed that the Troy facility shipped a negligible amount of products to the Mexican affiliate. Finally, the official confirmed directly that there had not been a shift in production from the subject firm to the Mexican affiliate in the relevant period.

The petitioner also alleges that there was a shift in production from the subject firm to Canada in the relevant period.

In the initial investigation, a shift in production to Canada was acknowledged; however the shift was not considered significant. In the investigation pursuant to the reconsideration, the company official indicated that the shift in production to Canada represented a negligible portion of production at the subject plant, and was not projected to increase.

The petitioner further alleges that a specific product (Rinse Conditioner GL) was shifted to Canada.

The company official indicated that this product was temporarily shifted to Canada while the machinery in Euclid, Ohio was being set up. However, this production, in tandem with all other production shifted to Canada, was not considered significant.

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]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

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