

obtained by the Department during the reconsideration revealed that the move was due to the decreased amount of timber around the Toutle area and the plentiful amount of timber around the new location.

Accordingly, the Department determines that the petitioning worker group has not satisfied Section 223(a)(2)(A)(C) and are not eligible to apply for worker adjustment assistance under the Trade Act.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA), the subject worker group must be certified eligible to apply for TAA. Since the petitioning worker group is denied eligibility to apply for TAA, the subject workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

Conclusion

After careful reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Weyerhaeuser Green Mountain Lumber Mill, Toutle, Washington.

Signed at Washington, DC this 28th day of March 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8-8980 Filed 4-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,698]

Bodycote Materials Testing, Inc., Engineering and Technology Division, Hillsdale, MI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 6, 2008, 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 8, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 22, 2008 (73 FR 9836).

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department for workers of Bodycote Materials Testing, Inc., Engineering and Technology Division, Hillsdale, Michigan was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner states that services provided by workers at the subject firm "are integral to the production of an automobile". The petitioner further states that the workers of the subject firm "produce data (written certification) that is used to determine if the product does meet the requirements."

The petitioner alleges that because all manufacturers of automotive products are required to test their products independently using the services provided by such companies as Bodycote Materials Testing, Inc., workers of the subject firm who provide the testing services should be certified eligible for TAA.

The investigation revealed that the workers of Bodycote Materials Testing, Inc., Engineering and Technology Division, Hillsdale, Michigan are engaged in testing services to the automotive, appliance, and general industrial markets. These functions, as described above, are not considered production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act.

Any incidental documents, such as written certifications, generated as a result of testing of the equipment are incidental to the services provided by the subject firm. The fact that a written record is generated in the process does not make the service firm a production firm and these documents do not constitute production of an article for purposes of the Trade Act.

The petitioner also states that Bodycote intends to move jobs to Mexico and Canada.

The allegation of a shift to another country might be relevant if it was determined that workers of the subject firm produced an article. However, the investigation determined that workers of Bodycote Materials Testing, Inc., Engineering and Technology Division, Hillsdale, Michigan do not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

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 in Washington, DC, this 26th day of March 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8-8983 Filed 4-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,341]

Nortel Networks Corporation Global Order Fulfillment, Research Triangle Park, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked February 4, 2008, three petitioners 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 January 16, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 1, 2008 (73 FR 6213).

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department for workers of Nortel Networks Corporation, Global Order Fulfillment, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner states that the determination document incorrectly describes activities performed by the workers of the subject firm. The petitioner states that the workers fulfilled customer orders for telecommunications network "solutions" and not "software."

The change in the description of the activities from "software" to "solutions" does not change the fact that the workers of the subject firm do not produce an article and do not directly support production of any kind. The investigation revealed that the workers of the subject firm receive, monitor the progression and process customer orders, collect data and ensure its accuracy and fulfillment. These activities do not constitute production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

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 in Washington, DC, this 25th day of March 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8-8979 Filed 4-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,688]

SEI Data, Inc., a Subsidiary of SEI Communications, Dillsboro, IN; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 7, 2008, 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 7, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 22, 2008 (73 FR 9836).

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 negative TAA determination issued by the Department for workers of SEI Data, Inc., a subsidiary of SEI Communications, Dillsboro, Indiana was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner states that employment at the subject firm was negatively impacted by a shift of job functions to Canada. The petitioner further states that regardless whether workers of the subject firm produce a product or provide services, they should be certified eligible for Trade Adjustment Assistance.

The investigation revealed that the workers of SEI Communications, Dillsboro, Indiana are engaged in activities related to providing technical support for Internet and telephone services. These functions, as described above, are not considered production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The allegation of a shift to another country might be relevant if it was determined that workers of the subject firm produced an article. Since the investigation determined that workers of SEI Communications, Dillsboro, Indiana

do not produce an article however, there cannot be imports nor a shift in production of an "article" abroad within the meaning of the Trade Act of 1974 in this instance.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

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 in Washington, DC, this 28th day of March 2008.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E8-8982 Filed 4-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-61, 696]

Medtronic, Inc. Cardiovascular Division, Santa Rosa, CA; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand

On February 27, 2008, the United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the Department of Labor's motion for voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Medtronic, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 07-362.

The worker-filed petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA), dated June 14, 2007, alleged that the subject workers produced "medical stents" and that the subject firm shifted production to a foreign country. Petitioners did not identify the foreign country to which production shifted.

On July 19, 2007, the Department of Labor (Department) issued a negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for TAA/ATAA for workers and former workers of Medtronic, Inc.,