Petitioners (union/workers/firm)	Location	Date received	Date of petition	Petition No.	Articles produced
General Motors Corp—Service Parts (Wkrs) Jen-Bel, Inc. (Wkrs)	Sparks, NVYoungstown, OH	04/03/95 04/03/95	03/22/95 03/23/95	30,893 30,894	Service—Security Guards. Sewing Contractor of Ladies' Coats.
Lar Sportswear Co. (Wkrs)		04/03/95 04/03/95 04/03/95	03/25/95 03/23/95 03/23/95	30,895 30,896 30.897	

APPENDIX—Continued

[FR Doc. 95–9556 Filed 4–17–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

Footwear Management Co.; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In the matter of: TA-W-30,545 Nocona Boot Company, Nocona, Texas; TA-W-30,545A Tony Lama Division, El Paso, Texas; A/K/A Justin Management Company, El Paso, Texas; TA-W-30,545B Justin Boot Company, Fort Worth, Texas; TA-W-30,545C Justin Boot Company, Cassville, Missouri; TA-W-30,545D Justin Boot Company, Sarcoxie, Missouri; and TA-W-30,545E Justin Boot Company, Carthage, Missouri.

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued an Amended Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on February 9, 1995, applicable to all workers at the subject firm. The amended notice was published in the **Federal Register** on February 17, 1995 (60 FR 9409).

New information received from the company show that some of the workers at the Tony Lama Division, El Paso, Texas, had their unemployment insurance (UI) taxes paid to Justin Management Company.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to properly reflect this matter.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–30,545 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Footwear Management Company in the following divisions: Tony Lama Division, El Paso, Texas, a/k/a Justin Management Company, El Paso, Texas; Justin Boot Company, Fort Worth, Texas; Cassville, Missouri; Sarcoxie, Missouri; and Carthage Missouri and the Nocona Boot Company in Nocona, Texas who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 29, 1993 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 6th day of April 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95–9566 Filed 4–17–95; 8:45 am]

[NAFTA-00340]

Leland Electrosystems, Inc., Erie, PA; Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By an application postmarked March 24, 1995, the petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the subject petition for transitional adjustment assistance (NAFTA–TAA). The denial notice was issued on February 27, 1995 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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The findings show that the workers produced aerospace spare parts for various electrical starters, motors and generators for the aerospace industry. The subject plant closed on January 11, 1995 as a result of an eviction notice from the landlord. All production was transferred to another domestic corporate facility in Ohio. A domestic transfer of production would not form a basis for a worker group certification.

The Department's denial was based on the fact that there was no shift in production from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada, nor did the subject firm import aerospace parts from Mexico or Canada. The Department's survey also revealed that the customer

imports from Mexico or Canada did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

On further review the findings show that the "dominant cause" for the worker separations was the closing down of the subject facility resulting from the eviction notice.

Petitioners allege a decline in sales and orders in overseas markets, v.g. Canada, England, Scotland, Singapore and China. A decline in export sales and orders would not form a basis for a worker group certification.

Petitioners also name a customer with facilities in Mexico and Puerto Rico that had declining purchases from the subject firm. The findings show that the named customer was a very small customer of the subject firm in the relevant time periods. The named customer accounted for less than one-half of one percent of Leland's sales in each of the relevant periods. Further, shipments from Puerto Rico are not considered imports as Puerto Rico is within the U.S. Custom Trade Zone.

The workers were also denied trade adjustment assistance under petition TA–W–30,677.

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, D.C., this 3rd day of April, 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95–9558 Filed 4–17–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–M