

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 petition for the workers of Flowserve, Williamsport, Pennsylvania 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 petitioners allege that they are import impacted because their company's contract with a foreign customer "specifies that 50% of the contract work will be done at (foreign) facilities." Further, the petitioners note that Flowserve is required to buy valves and materials from foreign vendors and re-sell them to their foreign customer "thus taking work away from Williamsport."

Contact with a company official confirmed that all production for this customer was exclusively for export purposes.

As trade adjustment assistance is concerned exclusively with whether imports impact layoffs of petitioning worker groups, the above-mentioned allegations regarding agreements between the subject firm and their foreign customer base are irrelevant.

The petitioners list several Flowserve affiliates that have been certified for trade adjustment assistance due to import impact, and suggest that, as a result, the petitioning worker group should be equally eligible.

In fact, all of the facilities listed by the petitioners were certified due to increased imports from the company of products like or directly competitive with those produced at the certified facilities. In the case of the subject firm, sales and production were relatively stable during the investigative period and any declines immediately prior to plant closure corresponded with a shift of production to an affiliated domestic facility. There was no evidence of import impact; as has been established above, the only foreign production impact allegations did not concern imports.

#### 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 decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC this 8th day of April, 2003.

**Edward A. Tomchick**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-9148 Filed 4-14-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,016]

#### Laird Technologies, Delaware Watergap, PA; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

By application of February 11, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on February 3, 2003, and will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The petition for the workers of Laird Technologies, Delaware Watergap, Pennsylvania 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 customers of the workers' firm. The survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imported metal stampings.

The petitioner states that the Department did not address allegations indicated in the petition of the subject firm as a "secondarily" affected firm. The petitioner further states that a list of trade certified firms that were also subject firm customers was attached to the petition.

Upon review of the original investigation, it appears that the Department overlooked the petitioners' assertion that they acted as an upstream supplier to firms listed on an attached page that were allegedly trade certified. A company official was contacted in regard to this list of customers in order to establish which facility locations may have been customers of the subject firm in the relevant period, and the amount of business that these customers accounted for at the subject firm. Of the listed firms that were revealed as trade certified, the customer sales data provided by the company official revealed that these customers

cumulatively accounted for a negligible amount of the customer base, and thus did not contribute to layoffs at the subject firm.

Furthermore, as established in the original investigation, the preponderance in sales, production and employment declines are attributed to the subject firm's shifting a portion of production that services the export market, and therefore is unrelated to import impact.

In conclusion, the "upstream supplier" group eligibility requirement of section 222(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met.

#### Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Laird Technologies, Delaware Watergap, Pennsylvania.

Signed at Washington, DC this 2nd day of April, 2003.

**Edward A. Tomchick,**

*Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 03-9147 Filed 4-14-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,588]

#### Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on February 19, 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 applicable to workers of Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, Michigan was signed on February 5, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 2003 (68 FR 8620).

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