DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–36,357]

Golden Sunlight Mines Incorporated, Whitehall, MT; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at the Golden Sunlight Mines, Incorporated, Whitehall, Montana. The application contained no new substantial information which would bear importantly on the Department's determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA–W–36,357; Golden Sunlight Mines, Incorporated, Whitehall, Montana (November 5, 1999)

Signed at Washington, DC this 5th day of November, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–30461 Filed 11–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–36,814]

Grand Rapids Diecast, Grand Rapids, MI; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on October 13, 1999, applicable to workers of Grand Rapids Diecast located in Walker, Michigan. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on November 4, 1999 (64 FR 60231).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that the Department incorrectly identified the subject firm location. The investigation conducted for the subject firm was conducted on behalf of the workers at the zinc plated plumbing fixture facility located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Walker, Michigan, is the Corporate headquarters and warehouse of the subject firm and is not the subject of the investigation. The Department is amending the certification determination to correctly identify the city to read Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–36,814 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Grand Rapids Diecast, Grand Rapids, Michigan who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 27, 1998 through October 13, 2001 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 8th day of November, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–30451 Filed 11–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–35,893, et al.]

Natchiq, Inc., Anchorage, AK, et al.; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated September 9, 1999, a company official (the 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 Natchiq, Incorporated and Alaska Petroleum Contractors, both companies with locations in Anchorage, Alaska and Houston, Texas. The denial notice was signed on July 26, 1999 and published in the **Federal Register**, on August 11, 1999 (64 FR 43723).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) It 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 petitioner states that perhaps the TAA petition was filed prematurely, and provided employment date for May through August 1998 and May through August 1999; revenues for May through August 1998 and May through August 1999 as well as the forecast revenues for the full year 1999.

The petitioner states that while hundreds of workers were being laid off due to capital expenditure cuts, they were hiring a significant number of employees for a one-year project. That resulted in the revenues and employment numbers being skewed.

The petitioner adds that the workers at Natchiq perform all executive and administrative service functions for their entities, including Alaska Petroleum Contractors. The workers at Alaska Petroleum Contractors include construction, fabrication, maintenance, and project management personnel, including general labor, welders, pipefitters, ironworkers, and clerical for oil industry clients.

The petition filed with the Department by the company on behalf of workers of the subject firms was dated March 8, 1999. The petition investigation for Natchiq, Incorporated and Alaska Petroleum Contractors was conducted for full years 1997 and 1998, and the partial year period of January through April for 1998 and 1999. Upon receipt of the petition, the Department is required to examine the criteria for certification for the representative base period consisting of the four quarters immediately preceding the date of the petition. Therefore, the Department could not conduct its investigation for a period ending August 1999 when the petition was dated March 1999.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers of Natchiq, Incorporated, Anchorage, Alaska and Houston, Texas was denied because the workers provided a service and did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the worker group eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers of Alaska Petroleum Contractors, Anchorage, Alaska and Houston, Texas was denied because criteria (1) and (2) of the worker group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended were not met. Revenues and employment increased during the relevant time period.

Conclusion

After review of the application 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.