

TA-W-51,235; *Fishing Vessel (F/V) Halowawa, Ketchikan, AK*: March 12, 2002.

TA-W-51,225; *Compton Corp., Naugatuck Facility, Naugatuck, CT*: March 13, 2002.

TA-W-51,155; *Buckbee-Mears St. Paul, a Div. of BMC, Inc., St. Paul, MN*: March 10, 2002.

TA-W-51,147; *Manitowoc Boom Trucks, Inc., d/b/a Manitex, York, PA*: March 10, 2002.

TA-W-51,143; *Tyco Healthcare Retail Group, a Div. of Tyco Healthcare, including leased workers of Manpower and Adecco, Harmony, PA*: March 13, 2002.

TA-W-51,135; *Advance USA LLC, New Stanton, PA*: March 12, 2002.

TA-W-51,124; *Pass and Seymour, Compression Molding Group, a subsidiary of Legrand, including leased workers of The Holland Group, Concord, NC*: March 6, 2002.

TA-W-51,122; *Emerson Appliance Controls, Frankfort, IN*: March 5, 2002.

TA-W-51,065; *GE Interlogix, North St. Paul, MN*: March 4, 2002.

TA-W-50,982; *Tarkett, Inc., Sample Department, a subsidiary of Domco Tarket, Inc., including leased workers of Hobart-West and Adecco, Newburgh, NY*: February 13, 2002.

TA-W-50,882; *Pirelli Power and Cable Systems LLC, Energy Div., Colusa, CA*: February 3, 2002.

TA-W-50893; *Best Manufacturing Group LLC, Griffin, GA*: February 10, 2002.

TA-W-50,873; *Scantibodies Laboratory, Inc., Pregnancy Test Kit/PTK Quality Control Department, Santee, CA*: January 29, 2002.

TA-W-50,871; *Jabil Circuit, Inc., St. Petersburg, FL*: February 10, 2002.

TA-W-50,851; *Sentex Systems, a Div. of Link Door Controls, Chatsworth, CA*: January 30, 2002.

TA-W-50,906; *ArvinMeritor, Inc., including leased workers of Randstad Staffing, Gordonsville, TN*: March 11, 2002.

TA-W-50,824; *Formtech Enterprises, Inc., Quick Plastics Div., including leased workers of Kelly Services, Inc., Jackson, MI*: February 6, 2002.

TA-W-50,816; *Nevamar Co., High Pressure Laminite Div., Hampton, SC*: February 4, 2002.

TA-W-50,785; *RMI Titanium Co., Niles, OH*: January 17, 2002.

TA-W-50,766; *Vishay Sprague Sanford, Inc., Sanford, ME*: April 4, 2003.

TA-W-50,293; *Mitsubishi Electric Automation, Inc., Vernon Hills, IL*: December 9, 2001.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103-182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA-TAA) and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA-TAA issued during the month of March 2003.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA-TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) That imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increased imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA-TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA-TAA-07626; *Maidenform, Inc., Jacksonville, FL*
NAFTA-TAA-06288; *Regal Plastics, LLC, Roseville, MI*

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

The investigation revealed that the workers of the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of section 250(a) of the Trade Act, as amended.

None.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA-TAA

None.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of March 2003. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C-5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: March 28, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-8338 Filed 4-4-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-50,492]

Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on March 3, 2003, a company official 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 Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, Michigan was signed on February 7, 2003, and will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

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 was filed on behalf of a worker at Adventure Travel, Iron Mountain, Michigan engaged in activities related to travel services. The petition was denied because the petitioning worker did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner appears to allege that "the 'article' definitions from the U.S.