cleaners/washers at the subject firm decreased during the relevant period. Rather, sales and production levels at the subject firm increased in 2006 from 2005 levels, and increased during January through July 2007 from January through July 2006 levels. The investigation also revealed that the subject firm did not shift production of parts cleaners/washers abroad. Rather, the shift of production was to an affiliated, domestic facility. Therefore, the Department determined that neither Section 222(a)(2)(A) nor Section 222(a)(2)(B) was satisfied.

The petitioner contends that ''no automatic parts washers were manufactured in Mexico, but pressure washers are being manufactured in Mexico'' and that it does not matter that ''the manufacture of our specific product did not go to Mexico, because our company produces a family of products. Transfer of one product in the family, affects the other products in the family.''

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.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner did not provide any new facts or allege any mistake of facts. Rather, the petitioner alleges that the Department has misinterpreted the law—that the shift of production of pressure washers from C-Tech Industries, Camas, Washington, to Mexico is a basis for a certification of eligibility for workers and former workers of C-Tech Industries, A Subsidiary of Alfred Karcher GMBH & Co. KG, Calumet, Michigan to apply for TAA and ATAA.

The statute requires that the shift of production abroad must be of an article that is like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm. Because pressure washers and automatic parts washers are not similar to each other and are not directly competitive with each other, the Department determines that the shift of pressure washers to Mexico cannot be the basis for certification of a worker group that produces parts washers.

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 24th day of September 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–19181 Filed 9–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,674]

EGS Electrical Group, Sola/Hevi-Duty Division, Nashville, TN; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at EGS Electrical Group, Sola/Hevi-Duty Division, Nashville, Tennessee. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, a letter of dismissal was issued, which constitutes a negative determination regarding the application for reconsideration.

TA–W–61,674; EGS Electrical Group Sola/ Hevi-Duty Division Nashville, Tennessee (September 4, 2007).

Signed at Washington, DC this 21st day of September 2007.

Ralph DiBattista,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–19178 Filed 9–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,671]

Faradyne Motors, A Joint Venture of ITT Industries and Pentair, Incorporated, Formerly Known as Success Enterprises LLC, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Kelly Services, Newark, NY, Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on June 20, 2007, applicable to workers of Faradyne Motors, A Joint Venture of ITT Industries and Pentair, Inc., Newark, New York. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 9, 2007 (72 FR 37365).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of motors for pumps. The subject firm originally named Success Enterprises LLC was renamed Faradyne Motors due to a corporate decision in 2006. The State agency reports that some workers wages at the subject firm are being reported under the Unemployment Insurance (UI) tax account for Success Enterprises LLC, Newark, New York.

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 Faradyne Motors who were adversely affected by increased company imports following a shift in production to China.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–61,671 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Faradyne Motors, A Joint Venture of ITT Industries and Pentair, Inc., formerly known as Success Enterprises LLC, including on-site leased workers from Kelly Services, Newark, New York, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 11, 2006, through June 20, 2009, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 24th day of September 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–19177 Filed 9–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–62,183]

Hartmann, Inc., Lebanon, TN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on September 21, 2007 in response to a worker petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Hartmann, Inc., Lebanon, Tennessee.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 24th day of September, 2007.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–19176 Filed 9–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,852]

Schnadig Corporation, Montoursville, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated September 3, 2007, 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 August 3, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on August 14, 2007 (72 FR 45451).

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, which was filed on behalf of workers at Schnadig Corporation, Montoursville, Pennsylvania engaged in the production of lawn and garden products, was denied based on the findings that during the relevant time period, the subject company did not separate or threaten to separate a significant number or proportion of workers, as required by Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleges that because he was a part of the initially certified worker group and remained employed by the subject firm after all the production stopped and beyond the expiration date of the original TAA certification, he should be also eligible for TAA.

The workers of the subject firm were previously certified eligible for TAA (TA–W–55,198). This certification expired on July 15, 2006. The investigation revealed that production at the subject firm ceased in August of 2004.

When assessing eligibility for TAA, the Department exclusively considers the relevant employment data (for one year prior to the date of the petition and any imminent layoffs) for the facility where the petitioning worker group was employed. In this case, the employment since the expiration of the previous certification was considered. The subject firm did not separate or threaten to separate a significant number of proportion of workers as required by Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. Significant number or proportion of the workers in a firm or appropriate subdivision means at least three workers in a workforce of fewer than 50 workers, five percent of the workers in a workforce of over 50 workers, or at least 50 workers.

Moreover, in its investigation, the Department considers production that occurred one year prior to the date of the petition as required in the Trade Adjustment Assistance regulations. Thus the period ending in 2004 is outside of the relevant period as established by the current petition date of July 12, 2007. The investigation revealed that the subject facility did not manufacture articles since 2004 and workers of the subject firm were not engaged in production of an article or supporting production of the article during the relevant time period. The Department further found that no new information was provided to contradict the original negative findings.

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 21st day of September, 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–19179 Filed 9–27–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,864; TA–W–61,864C]

Syroco, Inc., Baldwinsville, NY, Including an Employee Located in Houston, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and

Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on July 27, 2007, applicable to workers of Syroco, Inc., Baldwinsville, New York. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on August 9, 2007 (72 FR 44865).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that a worker separation has occurred involving an employee of the Baldwinsville, New York facility of Syroco, Inc. located in Houston, Texas. Mr. John Minnelli provided sales support services for the production of plastic patio furniture that is produced at the Baldwinsville, New York location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include an employee of the Baldwinsville, New York facility of Syroco, Inc., located in Houston, Texas.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Syroco, Inc., Baldwinsville, New York who were adversely affected by increased customer imports.