

www.doleta.gov/tradeact under the searchable listing of determinations.

Dated: June 30, 2010.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-16415 Filed 7-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under Section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (“the Act”) and are identified in the Appendix to this

notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to Section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment

Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than July 19, 2010.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than July 19, 2010.

Copies of these petitions may be requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Requests may be submitted by fax, courier services, or mail, to FOIA Disclosure Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance (ETA), U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210 or to foiarequest@dol.gov.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th of June 2010.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

APPENDIX

[TAA petitions instituted between 6/14/10 and 6/18/10]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
74240	Baker Hughes (Company)	Broussard, LA	06/14/10	06/08/10
74241	Allen Canning Company (Company)	Hessmer, LA	06/14/10	06/14/10
74242	Steris Corporation (Company)	Erie, PA	06/15/10	06/14/10
74243	Wardwell Braiding Machine Company (Workers)	Central Falls, RI	06/15/10	06/08/10
74244	Manulife Financial (State/One-Stop)	Boston, MA	06/15/10	06/15/10
74245	Omya, Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Cincinnati, OH	06/15/10	06/11/10
74246	Bank of America (Workers)	State College, PA	06/15/10	06/11/10
74247	Trinity Industries, Inc. (Workers)	Quincy, IL	06/16/10	06/15/10
74248	Hewlett-Packard Company (HP) (State/One-Stop)	Palo Alto, CA	06/16/10	06/04/10
74249	Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Nutley, NJ	06/16/10	06/15/10
74250	Charming Shoppes of Delaware, Inc. (Company)	Bensalem, PA	06/16/10	06/15/10
74251	Almatis, Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Bauxite, AR	06/16/10	06/15/10
74252	Honeywell International, Inc. (Workers)	Phoenix, AZ	06/17/10	06/10/10
74253	International Business Machines (IBM) (State/One-Stop)	Phoenix, AZ	06/17/10	06/03/10
74254	National Carton and Coating Company (State/One-Stop)	Xenia, OH	06/17/10	06/07/10
74255	Ford Motor Credit (Workers)	Greenville, SC	06/17/10	06/07/10
74256	Ferrous Metal Processing (State/One-Stop)	Brooklyn, OH	06/17/10	05/15/10
74257	Hewlett Packard Company (Company)	Palo Alto, CA	06/17/10	05/16/10
74258	RWD Technologies (State/One-Stop)	Troy, MI	06/17/10	05/26/10
74259	Dot Industries Deco' Plate (State/One-Stop)	Lapeer, MI	06/17/10	05/26/10
74260	xpedx (State/One-Stop)	Livonia, MI	06/17/10	05/26/10
74261	Kenco Logistic Services, LLC (Workers)	Evansville, IN	06/17/10	06/02/10
74262	Analogic Corporation (State/One-Stop)	Peabody, MA	06/17/10	06/14/10
74263	Sitton Motor Lines, Incorporated (Workers)	Joplin, MO	06/18/10	06/04/10
74264	Lazar Industries (Workers)	Siler City, NC	06/18/10	06/15/10
74265	Smith Micro Technologies (State/One-Stop)	St. Paul, MN	06/18/10	06/17/10
74266	Prudential Financial (Workers)	Moosic, PA	06/18/10	06/17/10
74267	Mason County Forest Products (Company)	Shelton, WA	06/18/10	06/14/10

[FR Doc. 2010-16414 Filed 7-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-73,536]

Allstate Insurance Company, Altoona Express Market Claim Office, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Kelly Services, Altoona, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated June 7, 2010, 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 Allstate Insurance Company, Altoona Express Market Claim Office, including on-site leased workers from Kelly Services, Altoona, Pennsylvania. The negative determination was issued on May 7, 2010, and the Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 28, 2010 (75 FR 30073).

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 determination applicable to the subject workers was based on the findings that the subject firm did not import services like or directly competitive with insurance claim services during the relevant period of the investigation or shift service abroad during the same period; and that the workers did not supply a service that was used by a firm that employed a worker group currently eligible to apply for TAA.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that she had "verbal confirmation from the Altoona management team that the services being provided by the call center(s) operating in India are directly competitive to the services that were provided by" the subject facility.

After this office received the request for reconsideration, the investigator

obtained from the petitioner the name of the subject firm manager who was alleged to be able to confirm the shift to India. However, the official confirmed that insurance claim services provided by the subject facility were distributed to other domestic offices of the subject firm and were not shifted abroad.

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 22nd day of June 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-16421 Filed 7-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-73,416]

Desoto Mills LLC, Fort Payne, AL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated June 1, 2010, a company official 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 determination was signed on April 28, 2010, and the Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on May 28, 2010 (75 FR 30072).

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 determination applicable to workers and former workers at Desoto Mills, LLC, a Subsidiary of Fruit of the Loom, Fort Payne, Alabama, was based on the findings that there was neither an increase in imports nor a shift/acquisition by the workers' firm that contributed importantly to the worker group separations; the subject workers are not secondarily-affected workers; and the workers' firm was not identified in an affirmative finding of injury by the International Trade Commission.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that the steady decline in sales and production at the subject firm "has caused the entire distribution and administrative support operation to be consolidated into existing Fruit of the Loom * * * locations outside the Desoto Mills Plant." The petitioner compares the situation at this location with similar shifts of production and subsequent downsizing of administrative and distribution staff that have resulted in TAA certifications (TA-W-63,167, TA-W-71,012, TA-W-72,253, and TA-W-73,414).

The initial investigation revealed that there was a shift of production of socks from the subject location in 2006 and 2007, and that, following the shift, distribution work at the Fort Payne, Alabama facility continued with the workers processing foreign-produced socks.

Additional information provided by the applicant revealed that, since March 2007, the subject facility has not supported a domestic, affiliated production facility and no significant degree of the supply of distribution services has been shifted to a foreign country.

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.