ACTION: Reopening and extension of period for submission of nominations.

SUMMARY: This document re-opens and extends the period for submission of nominations for the Secretary of Labor's New Freedom Initiative Award. This action is taken to permit increased participation by interested stakeholders.

DATES: Nomination packages must be submitted to the Office of Disability Employment Policy by June 6, 2003. Any application received after 4:45 p.m. EDST on June 6, 2003 will not be considered unless it was received before the award is made and:

1. It was sent by registered or certified mail no later than the 3rd calendar day before June 6, 2003;
2. It is determined by the Government that the late receipt was due solely to mishandling by the Government after receipt at the U.S. Department of Labor at the address indicated; or
3. It was sent by U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Next Day Service—Post Office to Addressee, not later than 5 p.m. at the place of mailing two (2) working days, excluding weekends and Federal holidays, prior to June 6, 2003.

The only acceptable evidence to establish the date of mailing of a late application sent by registered or certified mail is the U.S. Postal Service postmark on the envelope or wrapper and on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service. If the postmark is not legible, an application received after the above closing time and date will be processed as if mailed late. ''Postmark'' means a printed, stamped, or otherwise placed impression (not a postage meter machine impression) that is readily identifiable without further action as having been applied and affixed by an employee of the U.S. Postal Service on the date of mailing. Therefore, applicants should request that the postal clerk place a legible hand cancellation bull's-eye'' postmark on both the receipt and the envelope or wrapper.

The only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt at the U.S. Department of Labor is the date/time stamp of the Office of Disability Employment Policy on the application wrapper or other documentary evidence or receipt maintained by that office.

Applications sent by other delivery services, such as Federal Express, UPS, etc., will also be accepted; however, the applicant bears the responsibility of timely submission.

ADDRESSES: Nomination packages must be submitted to the Office of Disability Employment Policy, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room S–1303 Washington DC 20210; Telephone (202) 693–7880; TTY (202) 693–7881.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dina Dorich of the Office of Disability Employment Policy, telephone (202) 693–7859; TTY (202) 693–4920 (these are not toll-free numbers), prior to the closing deadline.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of February 18, 2003 (68 FR 7893), the Office of Disability Employment Policy published a Solicitation of Nominations for the Secretary of Labor's New Freedom Initiative Award. Nomination packages were to be submitted to the Office of Disability Employment Policy by May 15, 2003.

Because of the continuing interest in this solicitation, the agency believes that is desirable to re-open and extend the period for submission of nominations. Therefore, the period for submission of nominations is extended until June 6, 2003.

Signed at Washington, DC this 14th day of May, 2003.

W. Roy Grizzard, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary, Office of Disability, Employment Policy.

[FR Doc. 03–12446 Filed 5–16–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–CX–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of May 2003.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated; and

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or sub-division have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

None

In the following case, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

The investigation revealed that criterion (a)(2)(A)(I.C.) (Increased imports) and (a) (2)(B) (II.B) (No shift in production to a foreign country) have not been met.

TA–W–50,783; Precise Courtesy Corp., Buffalo Grove, IL
TA–W–51,523; Stimson Lumber Co., Arden, WA
TA–W–51,595; Paradise Fisheries, Kodiak, AK
TA–W–51,242; Polyone Corp., O'Sullivan Plastic Div., Yerlington, NE
TA–W–50,867; Eaton Corp., Oshtemo Aftermarket Operation, Ostemo, MI

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–51,149; Applied Industrial Technologies, Cloquet, MN
TA–W–51,628; Boeing Aerospace Operations, Long Beach, CA
TA–W–51,456; Symbol Technologies, Chicago Service Center, Arlington Heights, ILA
TA–W–51,434; Power Quest Corp., Orem, UT
TA–W–51,426; 360Networks (USA), Inc., Broomfield, CO

The investigation revealed that criterion (a)(2)(A) (I.A) (no employment declines) have not been met.

TA–W–51,620; Fishing Vessel (F/V) Misty Dawn, King Cove, AK
TA–W–51,632; Fishing Vessel (F/V), Capt'n Jay, Chignik, AK
TA–W–51,208; The Stanley Works, Stanley Access Technologies Div., Farmington, CT
TA–W–51,197; The Boeing Co., Integrated Defense Systems Div., Pueblo, CO
TA–W–51,024 & A, B; Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel Corp., Wheeling, WV, Follansbee, WV and Beech Bottom, WV

The investigation revealed that criterion (a)(2)(A) (I.B.) (Sales or production, or both, did not decline) and (II.B) (has shifted production to a

country not under the free trade agreement with the U.S.) have not been met.

TA–W–51,539; Divine Brothers Co., Utica, NY

TA–W–51,633; Fishing Vessel (F/V) Jackie, Metlakatla, AK

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2) (A) (I.C) (Increased imports) and (a)(2)(B) (II.C) (Has shifted production to a county not under the free trade agreement with U.S.) have not been met.

TA–W–51,388; Solid State-Filtronic, Inc., Compound Semiconductor, Santa Clara, CA

TA–W–51,038; Tubetronics, Wichita, KS

The following certification has been issued. The requirement of (a)(2)(A) (increased imports) of Section 222 and (II.B) (has shifted production to a country not under the free trade agreement with the U.S.) have not been met.

TA–W–51,488; Essex Electrical, Inc., Sikeston, MO

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name and location of each determination references the impact date for all workers of such determination.

The following certifications have been issued. The requirements of (a)(2)(A) (increased imports) of Section 222 have been met.

TA–W–51,118; Electrolux Home Products, Inc., Edison, NJ: March 3, 2002.

TA–W–50,450; A.M. Promotions, Inc., a Div. of Carnicella Enterprises, Inc., Ebensburg, PA: December 18, 2001.

TA–W–51,029; Winonics, Inc., Fort Worth, TX: February 27, 2002.

TA–W–51,042; Micron Technology, Inc., Boise and Nampa, ID: February 21, 2002.

TA–W–51,231; Micron Technology, Inc., Manassas, VA: March 10, 2002.

TA–W–51,267; Gemco, Inc., a Div. of Falcon Industries, Estill, SC: March 17, 2002.

TA–W–51,298; Faultless Caster, Evansville, IN: March 17, 2002.

TA–W–51,377; Weyerhaeuser, Plywood Div., Millport, AL: March 21, 2002.

TA–W–51,522; J.E. Morgan Knitting Mills (Sara Lee), Tamaqua, PA: May 4, 2003.

TA–W–51,575; CP Shades, Inc., Sausalito, CA: April 15, 2002.

TA–W–50,487; Nexpak, El Dorado Hills, CA: December 9, 2001.

TA–W–50,522; Louisiana Pacific Corp., Saratoga, WY: December 27, 2001.

TA–W–51,141; Werner Co., Greenville, PA: March 12, 2002.

TA–W–51,380; Colorado Med-Tech, Inc., including workers of Staffing Solutions, Boulder, CO: March 27, 2002.

TA–W–51,448; ITW, Div. of Hobart Corp., Troy, OH: March 28, 2002.

TA–W–51,478; VPI Mirrex, LLC, Delaware City Div., Delaware City, DE: March 28, 2002.

The following certifications have been issued. The requirements of (a)(2)(B) (shift in production) of Section 222 have been met.

TA–W–50,831; EIMCO, LLC, Bluefield, WV: February 3, 2002.

TA–W–50,674; Ametek, U.S. Gauge Div., Bartow, FL: January 21, 2002.

TA–W–51,247 & A; Agilent Technologies, Electronic Products and Solutions Group, Rohnert Park, CA and Santa Rosa, CA: March 13, 2002.

TA–W–51,354; Connor Manufacturing Services, Inc., Southern California Div., including leased workers of Amvigor Engineering Services, Weststaff, Inc., Harte Enterprises, Placement Pros, Helpmates Staffing Services, Corestaff Services and Abacus Staffing for Accounting, Corona, CA: March 25, 2002.

TA–W–51,556; Sylvan America, Inc., Kittanning, PA: April 15, 2002.

TA–W–51,557; Agilent Technologies, Design Validation Div., Colorado Springs, CO: May 26, 2003.

TA–W–51,561; Motorola, Broadband Communications Sector, Tewksbury, MA: April 18, 2002.

TA–W–51,627; Reliant Manufacturing LLC, Longmont, CO: April 25, 2002.

TA–W–51,273; Sonoco Products Co., Consumer Products Div., Denison, TX: March 7, 2002.

The following certification has been issued. The requirement of upstream supplier to a trade certified primary firm has been met.

TA–W–51,004; Fiber-Line, Inc., Hickory, NC: February 17, 2002.

TA–W–51,635; Rustler Fish Co., Haines, AK: April 29, 2002.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with section 250(a), Subchaper 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 May 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 increases 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.

None

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 May 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: May 9, 2003.

Terrence Clark,

Acting Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–12426 Filed 5–16–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,895 and TA–W–50,895A]

Americal Corporation, Goldsboro, NC, Americal Corporation Henderson, NC; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 12, 2003, applicable to workers of Americal Corporation, Goldsboro, North Carolina. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2003 (68 FR 14707).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of hosiery.

New findings show that worker separations occurred at the Henderson, North Carolina facility of the subject firm. Workers at Henderson, North Carolina produce leg wear (hosiery—full length, knee-length and thigh-lengths and socks) as well as occupy administrative offices for the subject firm.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers at Americal Corporation, Henderson, North Carolina.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Americal Corporation who were adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–50,895 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Americal Corporation, Goldsboro, North Carolina (TA–W–50,895) and Americal Corporation, Henderson, North Carolina (TA–W–50,895A), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 12, 2002, through March 12, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington DC this 7th day of May 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–12427 Filed 5–16–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,633]

Barry of Goldsboro, Goldsboro, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter dated March 25, 2003, the company requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on February 11, 2003, was based on the finding that the workers did not produce a product under the meaning of section 222 of the Act. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2003 (68 FR 14708).

To support the request for reconsideration, the company supplied additional information to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation. The company indicated that the plant workers were also engaged in value-added production that was necessary to complete the product (slippers).

An analysis of the functions supplied by the company on reconsideration show that the workers were engaged not only engaged in packaging and warehousing, but the actual finishing of the product (slippers).

An examination of information provided by the company during the initial investigation shows that the company shifted all plant production and related functions to Mexico during the relevant period.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that there were layoffs and a shift in production from the workers firm or subdivision to Mexico of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Barry of Goldsboro, Goldsboro, North Carolina. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Barry of Goldsboro, Goldsboro, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 20, 2002 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 1st day of May 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–12424 Filed 5–16–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,105]

Ericsson, Inc., Base Station and Systems Development Division, Research Triangle Park, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on March 14, 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 Ericsson, Inc., Base Station and Systems Development Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina was signed on February 21, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on March 10, 2003 (68 FR 11409).

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 workers at Ericsson, Inc., Base Station and Systems Development Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina engaged in activities related to the design and testing of software and hardware for radio base stations. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.