

STAT, Aerotek, Will Rogers,  
Richmond, VA, November 28, 2004.  
TA-W-58,388; Chuan Hing Sewing, Inc.,  
San Francisco, CA, November 21,  
2004.  
TA-W-58,456; WestPoint Home, Inc.,  
Bath Products Div., Ambassador  
Personnel, Valley, AL, December 2,  
2004.  
TA-W-58,327; Hewlett Packard,  
Ontario, CA, November 10, 2004.  
TA-W-58,526; IPF Management  
Company, Inc., d/b/a Invincible IPF,  
Paterson, NJ, December 20, 2004.

#### Negative Determinations for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In order for the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) for older workers, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Trade Act must be met.

In the following cases, it has been determined that the requirements of Section 246(a)(3)(ii) have not been met for the reasons specified.

Since the workers are denied eligibility to apply for TAA, the workers cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

TA-W-58,487; U.S. Airways, Greentree  
Reservations, Pittsburgh, PA.  
TA-W-58,274; Saint-Gobain Container,  
Carteret, NJ.  
TA-W-58,421; Sony Electronics, Direct  
View CRT, Mt. Pleasant, PA.  
TA-W-58,481; Collins and Aikman,  
Southwest Laminates, Inc. Division,  
El Paso, TX.

The Department as determined that criterion (1) of Section 246 has not been met. Workers at the firm are 50 years of age or older.

None.

The Department as determined that criterion (2) of Section 246 has not been met. Workers at the firm possess skills that are easily transferable.

TA-W-58,295; Pixelworks, Inc.,  
Tualatin, OR.  
TA-W-58,295A; Pixelworks, Inc.,  
Campbell, CA.  
TA-W-58,070; Carrier Access  
Corporation, Boulder, CO.  
TA-W-58,401; Accutech Mold and  
Engineering, Little Falls, MN.  
TA-W-57,987; Sun Chemical,  
Performance Pigments Division,  
Cincinnati, OH.

The Department as determined that criterion (3) of Section 246 has not been met. Competition conditions within the workers' industry are not adverse.

None.

I hereby certify that the  
aforementioned determinations were

issued during the month of January 2006. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C-5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: January 12, 2006.

**Erica R. Cantor,**

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-803 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,309]

##### OBG Manufacturing Company; Liberty, KY; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at OBG Manufacturing Company, Liberty, Kentucky. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-58,309; OBG Manufacturing  
Company, Liberty, Kentucky  
(January 11, 2006).

Signed at Washington, DC this 11th day of January 2006.

**Erica R. Cantor,**

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-802 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,047]

##### Plasti-Coil, Inc.; Lake Geneva, WI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of December 8, 2005 a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding

eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The denial notice was signed on November 10, 2005 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2005 (70 FR 72653).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Plasti-Coil, Inc., Lake Geneva, Wisconsin engaged in production of custom injection molding was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met, nor was there a shift in production from that firm to a foreign country. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's declining customers. The survey revealed no increase in imports of custom injection molding. The subject firm did not import custom injection molding in the relevant period, nor did it shift production to a foreign country.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner alleges that the layoffs at the subject firm are attributable to a shift in production to China. To support the allegations, the petitioner attached a copy of the letter from the subject firm's company official stating that "a significant portion of the business has been transferred to China".

A company official was contacted regarding the above allegations. The company official confirmed what was revealed during the initial investigation. In particular, the official stated that Plasti-Coil, Inc., Lake Geneva, Wisconsin was contemplating to move portion of its production to China, however, the shift did not occur and there are no current plans to move production from the subject firm to a foreign country. The official further clarified that the letter mentioned by the petitioner meant that the subject firm's customers transferred significant volumes of their business to China and other Asian countries, which had a negative impact on production of the