

previous investigation of this case. The subject worker group can be certified as eligible to apply for TAA as adversely affected secondary workers only if Murray Engineering either: (1) Supplied components or unfinished or semi-finished goods to a firm employing workers who are covered by a certification of eligibility for adjustment assistance; or (2) assembled or finished products made by such a firm. In the case at hand, neither criterion is met because Murray Engineering did no assembly or finishing work, nor did any of Murray Engineering's customers' workers receive a certification of eligibility to apply for TAA during the relevant time period.

In order to be eligible as suppliers of components or unfinished or semi-finished goods, as petitioner claims the subject worker group to be, the subject worker group must have produced a component part of the product that is the basis of the TAA certification. Because Murray Engineering did not produce a component part of a final product, they were not secondary suppliers of a TAA-certified facility, as required by section 222(b) of the Trade Act. Even if the design specifications were sometimes mounted or affixed to their customers' manufacturing equipment, the display of the design specifications on the equipment is not necessary for the equipment to function properly and does not enhance the equipment's performance; thus, the designs are not component parts.

Further, Murray Engineering did no business with a TAA-certified company during the relevant time period. The petitioning worker specifically claims that Murray Engineering provided designs to Lamb Technicon, a TAA-certified company (TA-W-40,267 & TA-W-40,267A). However, Murray Engineering did business with Lamb Technicon most recently in 1999, which is before the relevant time period for the Murray Engineering petition at issue in this case. Therefore, Lamb Technicon's certification (TA-W-40,267 & TA-W-40,267A) is not a valid basis for certifying Murray Engineering workers as adversely affected secondary workers eligible to apply for TAA.

#### Conclusion

As the result of the findings of the investigation on remand, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Murray Engineering, Inc., Complete Design Service, Flint, Michigan.

Signed in Washington, DC this 28th day of February, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1134 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

---

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,456]

##### Parker Cone Company, Maiden, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 1, 2005, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Parker Cone Company, Maiden, North Carolina.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. In order to establish a valid worker group, there must be at least three full-time workers employed at some point during the period under investigation. Workers of the group subject to this investigation did not meet this threshold level of employment. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 1st day of March 2005.

**Richard Church,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1138 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

---

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,517]

##### Shirley's Sewvac, Hermiston, OR; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on October 12, 2004, in response to a worker petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Shirley's SewVac, Hermiston, Oregon.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 17th day of February, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1142 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

---

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,606]

##### Solo Cup Company, Springfield, MO; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on February 18, 2005, in response to a petition filed by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Union, Local 1553 on behalf of workers at Solo Cup Company, Springfield, Missouri.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 1st day of March, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-1158 Filed 3-15-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

---

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Mine Safety and Health Administration

##### Petitions for Modification

The following parties have filed petitions to modify the application of existing safety standards under section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977.

##### 1. Snyder Coal Company

[Docket No. M-2005-007-C]

Snyder Coal Company, 66 Snyder Lane, Hegins, Pennsylvania 17938 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 77.403(a) (Mobile equipment; rollover protective structures (ROPS) to its N & L Slope Mine (MSHA I.D. No. 36-02203) located in Northumberland County, Pennsylvania. The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit the Case Front End Loader, Model W26B, S/N No. 9107513 to be used at the N & L Slope Mine without being equipped with rollover protection structures (ROPS). The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same