The Department of Labor issued a negative determination applicable to the petitioning group of workers on December 20, 2004 (TA–W–56,096). Consequently, further investigation would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of January 2005.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5–494 Filed 2–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,129A and TA–W–54,129D]

Kemet Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina; Including Employees of Kemet Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, SC, Located in Greenwood, SC; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility, To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on February 23, 2004, applicable to workers of KEMET Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 6, 2004 (69 FR 18111).

At the request of a company official, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Workers of KEMET's headquarters are included in the certification for workers at the Simpsonville Facility located in Simpsonville, South Carolina. New information provided by the firm shows that Mr. Larry Budreau and Mr. Jimmy Arflin were separated from employment with the firm. They were reporting to headquarters but were working out of Greenwood, South Carolina. They provided support services related to the electronic capacitors produced by the firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include employees of KEMET Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina working in Greenwood, South Carolina. Since the workers of the Simpsonville Facility were certified eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance, the Department is extending this eligibility to Mr. Larry Budreau and Mr. Jimmy Arflin.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of KEMET Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina, who were adversely affected by a shift in production to Mexico.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–54,129A is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of KEMET Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville Facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina (TA–W–54,129A), including employees of KEMET Electronics Corporation, Simpsonville facility, Simpsonville, South Carolina, located in Greenwood, South Carolina (TA–W–54,129D), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 3, 2004, through February 23, 2006, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 31st day of January 2005.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5–489 Filed 2–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–56,127]

Standard Corporation; A UTI Worldwide Company Kinston, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on December 3, 2004, in response to a worker petition filed by company official on behalf of workers at Standard Corporation, a UTi Worldwide Company, Kinston, North Carolina.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active certification, (TA–W–55,977) which expires on December 9, 2006. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 7th day of January 2005.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E5–490 Filed 2–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Announcement of the Mailing Addresses for Applications Not Filed Electronically Under the New Permanent Foreign Labor Certification (PERM) Program

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The regulation to implement the re-engineered permanent foreign labor certification program (PERM) was published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 2004, with an effective date of March 28, 2005. *See* 69 FR 77326. The Employment and Training Administration (ETA) of the Department of Labor (Department or DOL) is issuing this notice to announce the mailing addresses for employers that choose to file applications by mail under the new permanent foreign labor certification program. The Department encourages employers to file applications electronically as applications submitted by mail will not be processed as quickly as those filed electronically.

As of December 13, 2004, the Department opened two new National Processing Centers in Atlanta and Chicago. The National Processing Centers will handle permanent labor certification cases filed under the PERM system. In addition, these centers will process all applications that are withdrawn from the current permanent labor certification program and re-filed under the new PERM program.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Carlson, Chief, Division of Foreign Labor Certification, Employment and Training Administration, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room C–4312, Washington, DC 20210; Telephone: (202) 693–3010 (this is not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The new PERM regulation is effective March 28, 2005. Under the PERM program, employers will submit their applications for permanent labor certification directly to DOL using either electronic or mail-in options. Employers will, among other things, be required to obtain a prevailing wage determination from the appropriate State Workforce Agency (SWA) prior to filing their applications with DOL.

Until March 27, 2005, employers must continue to submit applications for permanent labor certification to State Workforce Agencies. All applications

for permanent labor certification received by the SWAs postmarked March 28, 2005 or later will be returned to the sender.

Employers choosing to use the e-filing option under the new PERM program will complete their applications via the Internet at *http://www.workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/foreign.* A major advantage of e-filing is the on-line system's ability to assist employers by instantaneously checking for obvious errors. This option will also speed the process of evaluating the applications, and prevent data entry errors.

For employers choosing to submit an application for permanent employment certification by U.S. mail, applications must be sent to one of the two National Processing Centers, as explained below.

If the area of intended employment is in one of the following states or territories, then the PERM application must be mailed to the Atlanta Processing Center at the address listed below:

Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Virginia, Washington DC, West Virginia, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Harris Tower, 233 Peachtree Street, NE., Suite 410, Atlanta, Georgia 30303; Phone: (404) 893–0101, Fax: (404) 893–4642.

If the area of intended employment is in one of the following states or territories then the PERM application must be mailed to the Chicago Processing Center at the address listed below:

Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 844 North Rush Street, 12th Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60611; Phone: (312) 886–8000, Fax: (312) 886–1688.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 31st day of January, 2005.

Emily Stover DeRocco,

Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration.

[FR Doc. 05–2373 Filed 2–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–51,173 and NAFTA–6472]

Ericsson, Inc., Brea, CA; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the Secretary of Labor's motion for a second voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Ericsson, Inc.* v. *U.S. Secretary of Labor* (Court No. 02–00809).

The Department's denial of the initial Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) petition was issued on April 15, 2003. The Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on August 18, 2003 (68 FR 49522). The negative determination was based on the finding that the worker group did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. The workers performed software development.

The Department's denial of the initial NAFTA–TAA petition was issued on September 24, 2002. The notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 10, 2002 (67 FR 63160). The negative determination was based on the finding that the worker group did not produce an article within the meaning of section 250(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. Workers at the subject facility developed software for other Ericsson units.

The Plaintiffs requested judicial review of the TAA case by letter to the USCIT, filed on December 18, 2002. In the letter, the Plaintiffs contended that the Department failed to fully investigate the TAA petition, that the subject worker group was misclassified, and that the Department did not correctly apply the statutory criteria. On August 20, 2003, the USCIT granted the Plaintiff's motion to consolidate the TAA case into the NAFTA case. On September 11, 2003, the USCIT issued a Voluntary Remand Order, directing the Department to determine whether the workers are eligible for benefits.

During the remand investigation, the Department investigated whether the workers produced an article and, if so, whether the workers were eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA. The investigation found that the subject worker group did not produce an article within the meaning of the Trade Act. The Department issued a Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration on Remand on January 14, 2004. The notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 23, 2004 (69 FR 3394).

On October 13, 2004, the USCIT again remanded the matter to the Department, finding that the Department failed to adequately investigate the Plaintiff's claims and that the Department's findings were unsupported by substantial evidence on the record. The USCIT directed the Department to investigate whether the workers were eligible for benefits.

During the second remand investigation, the Department raised additional questions and obtained detailed supplemental responses from the company. In particular, the new information indicates that, in addition to software development, the subject worker group supported production at an affiliated software production facility. As such, the subject worker group did engage in activity related to the production of an article. The second remand investigation also revealed that all production at the affiliated facility shifted to Canada during the relevant period and the subject firm simultaneously began importing the product from Canada.

The investigation revealed that the subject facility experienced employment declines during the relevant time and that the workers were in support of an affiliated production facility that is TAA and NAFTA–TAA certifiable. As such, the Department determines that the subject worker group meets the statutory criteria for TAA and NAFTA–TAA certification.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on remand, I determine that a shift of production to Canada of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm and the simultaneous imports of those articles from Canada, contributed importantly to the worker separations and sales or production declines at the subject firm.

In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act, I make the following certification:

''All workers of Ericsson, Inc., Brea, California (TA–W–51,173), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 6, 2002, through two years from the issuance of this revised determination, are eligible to apply for worker adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974,'' and''All workers of Ericsson, Inc., Brea, California (NAFTA 6472), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 1, 2001, through two years from the issuance of this revised determination, are eligible to apply