

- UL 1474 Adjustable Drop Nipples for Sprinkler Systems
- UL 1481 Power Supplies for Fire-Protective Signaling Systems
- UL 1486 Quick Opening Devices for Dry Pipe Valves for Fire-Protection Service
- UL 1557 Electrically Isolated Semiconductor Devices
- UL 1577 Optical Isolators
- UL 1682 Plugs, Receptacles and Cable Connectors, of the Pin and Sleeve Type
- UL 1876 Isolating Signal and Feedback Transformers for Use in Electronic Equipment
- UL 2006 Halon 1211 Recovery/Recharge Equipment
- UL 2111 Overheating Protection for Motors

### III. Temporary Reinstatement of NFPA 72

On September 14, 2009, OSHA published a notice (see 74 FR 47026) to modify the scopes of recognition (“scopes”) of several NRTLs because standards developing organizations (SDOs) withdrew a number of test standards from their catalog of published standards. Consequently, these NRTLs could no longer use the withdrawn test standards to certify selected products requiring certification under OSHA standards. In response to the SDOs’ action, OSHA’s 2009 **Federal Register** notice deleted the withdrawn standards from the scope of each affected NRTL, and added to the NRTL’s scopes any known replacement standard(s).

One of the withdrawn standards was ANSI/NFPA 72—Installation, Maintenance, and Use of Protective Signaling Systems. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) withdrew this test standard several years ago after integrating it into the National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code (NFASC), also designated NFPA 72. However, OSHA’s 2009 **Federal Register** notice did not list the NFASC document as a replacement for NFPA 72 because the NRTL Program requirements do not allow NRTLs to include general consensus codes or other similar standards in their scopes of recognition. Such standards do not meet the NRTL Program’s requirements for an “appropriate test standard,” i.e., the standards do not primarily specify testing requirements for particular types of products.

After OSHA deleted the NFPA 72 standard, several NRTLs contacted OSHA to request recognition for the NFASC. One NRTL informed OSHA that deleting the test standard so abruptly invalidated approvals for many

products. The NRTLs requested a two-year transition period to identify a comparable replacement test standard to use in certifying the affected products.

When OSHA determines that a comparable replacement test standard is not available, it may delay the effective date for deleting a withdrawn test standard from NRTLs’ scopes so the affected NRTLs can continue certifying products while identifying a comparable replacement standard. Accordingly, OSHA is temporarily reinstating NFPA 72 to the scopes of the affected NRTLs. The reinstatement period is retroactive to September 14, 2009, the date the standard was removed from these NRTLs’ scopes, and ends September 14, 2011. By September 14, 2010, each affected NRTL wishing to continue certifying the affected products must notify OSHA of the name(s) of comparable replacement test standard(s) the NRTL will use in place of NFPA 72. If not already in the NRTL’s scope, OSHA will add any such standard that is “appropriate,” provided the NRTL has the capability for the testing. By September 14, 2011, OSHA will remove NFPA 72 from all NRTLs’ scope, and these NRTLs must cease certifying products to NFPA 72, and certify products to the comparable replacement standard(s) in their scopes.

### IV. Authority and Signature

David Michaels, PhD, MPH, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, directed the preparation of this notice. Accordingly, the Agency is issuing this notice pursuant to Sections 6(b) and 8(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655 and 657), Secretary of Labor’s Order No. 5–2007 (72 FR 31160), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC, on February 22, 2010.

**David Michaels,**

*Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health.*

[FR Doc. 2010–4197 Filed 3–1–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510–26–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–71,388]

#### **Lucas-Smith Automotive, Inc.: Potosi, MO; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated January 22, 2010, the 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 Lucas-Smith Automotive, Inc., Potosi, Missouri (subject firm). The Notice of negative determination was signed on January 8, 2010. The Department’s Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 16, 2010 (75 FR 7039). Workers of the subject firm are engaged in employment related to the sales and service of new and used automobiles.

*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 initial investigation resulted in a denial based on the findings that imports of services like or directly competitive with the services provided by workers of the subject firm did not contribute to worker separations at the subject firm and that no shift in provision of the services to a foreign country occurred during the relevant period.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioners alleged that the subject firm is either a supplier or downstream producer to a TAA-certified firm and a loss of business with this firm contributed importantly to worker separations at the subject firm.

For the Department to issue a secondary worker certification under Section 222(c) to workers of a downstream producer, the subject firm must perform additional, value-added production processes or services directly for a TAA-certified firm. For the Department to issue a secondary worker certification under Section 222(c) to workers of an upstream supplier, the subject firm must produce and supply directly to a TAA-certified firm component parts for articles, or services, used in the production of articles or in the supply of services, that were the basis for the customers’ certification and the certified firm received certification of eligibility for TAA as a primary impacted firm.

The investigation revealed that the workers of the subject firm were engaged in sales and services of new

and used automobiles to individual owners at an automotive dealership. The workers of the subject firm did not perform additional, value-added production processes or services directly to any of the certified primary firms during the investigation period. Thus, the subject firm workers are not eligible for TAA as downstream producers under secondary impact. Further, the subject firm is not an upstream supplier because it did not provide services to a TAA-certified firm during the investigation period.

The petitioner also alleged that increased imports of foreign-produced automobiles negatively impacted business of the subject firm and, therefore, workers who perform sales and service of domestic automobiles should be eligible for TAA.

When assessing a worker group's eligibility to apply for TAA, the Department exclusively considers imports of articles like or directly competitive with those manufactured by the subject firm or services like or directly competitive with those supplied by the workers of the subject firm during the relevant period. It was revealed during the initial investigation that the subject firm neither imported services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by worker group nor shifted to or acquired from foreign country services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by worker group.

The petitioners did not supply facts not previously considered and did not provide any documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts 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 16th day of February, 2010.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4246 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-72,231]

#### **Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, PA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

On December 23, 2009, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice of affirmative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 6, 2010 (75 FR 878).

The initial investigation, initiated on September 8, 2009, resulted in a negative determination, issued on November 5, 2009, that was based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift in production to a foreign country occurred. The notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2010 (75 FR 3935).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied additional information to supplement that which was gathered during the initial investigation.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department carefully reviewed new information provided by the petitioner and contacted the company official for additional information and clarification of previously-submitted information.

The reconsideration investigation revealed that the subject firm is shifting production of articles like or directly competitive with cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients from the subject facility to a foreign country and that this shift on production contributed importantly to worker separations during the relevant period.

#### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, including on-site leased workers of Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, who are

engaged in employment related to the production of cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients, meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of Lonza, Inc., Riverside Plant, Lonza Exclusive Synthesis Section, Custom Manufacturing Division, including on-site leased workers of Lab Support, Aerotek, Job Exchange, and Synerfac, Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, who are engaged in employment related to the production of cGMP intermediates and Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 2, 2008, through two years from the date of this certification, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on date of certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 2nd day of February, 2010.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-4249 Filed 3-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

TA-W-71,375

#### **AK Steel Corporation, Mansfield Works Division, Including On-Site Leased Workers From Time Customized Staffing Solutions, Mansfield, OH; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

On January 8, 2010, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice of affirmative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 1, 2010 (75 FR 5145).

The initial investigation, initiated on June 24, 2009, resulted in a negative determination, issued on November 2, 2009, that was based on the finding that imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift in production to a foreign country occurred. The notice of negative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2010 (75 FR 3935).

To support the request for reconsideration, the petitioner supplied