

New information shows that ATW (Assembly Technology Worldwide) purchased certain assets of Bodine Corporation in November 2007. Some workers of the subject firm then became employees of ATW Bodine and their wages were reported under two separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax accounts for ATW Bodine and Bodine Corporation.

Information also shows that worker separations have occurred involving employees of the Bridgeport, Connecticut facility of the subject firm who are located in Goshen, Kentucky and Allison Park, Pennsylvania. Mr. John Artman and Mr. Kevin Moore provided sale function services for the Bridgeport, Connecticut location of the subject firm.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to properly reflect these matters.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Bodine Corporation who were adversely affected by increased customer imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-62,223 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Bodine Corporation, including workers whose wages were paid by ATW Bodine, Bridgeport, Connecticut, including employees in support of Bodine Corporation, including workers whose wages were paid by ATW Bodine, Bridgeport, Connecticut located in Goshen, Kentucky (TA-W-62,223A) and Allison Park, Pennsylvania (TA-W-62,223B), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 28, 2006, through November 20, 2009, 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 at Washington, DC this 10th day of January 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-840 Filed 1-17-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-61,449]

#### **Delphi Corporation, Automotive Holding Group; Including On-Site Leased Workers of Securitas, Bartech, TAC Automotive, Interim, Breckenridge Enterprises/Dividend Staffing and Kelly Services, Wichita Falls, TX; 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), and section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on May 25, 2007, applicable to workers of Delphi Corporation, Automotive holding Group, including on-site leased workers of Securitas, Bartech, TAC Automotive, Interim, Dividend Staffing, and Kelly Services, Wichita Falls, Texas. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 7, 2007 (72 FR 31615).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers were engaged in the production of exhaust oxygen sensors.

New information shows that the correct name of the on-site leasing firm Dividend Staffing should read Breckenridge Enterprises/Dividend Staffing. Some of the workers from Dividend Staffing separated from employment at the subject firm had their wages reported under the unemployment insurance (UI) tax account for Breckenridge Enterprises/Dividend Staffing. Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to clarify this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers employed on-site at Delphi Corporation, Automotive Holding Group, Wichita Falls, Texas, who were adversely affected by increased imports. The amended notice applicable to TA-W-61,449 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Delphi Corporation, Automotive Holding Group, including on-site leased workers of Securitas, Bartech, TAC Automotive, Interim, Breckenridge Enterprises/Dividend Staffing, and Kelly Services, Wichita Falls, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after April 30, 2006, through May 25, 2009, 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 at Washington, DC, this 10th day of January 2008.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-838 Filed 1-17-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-62,188]

#### **Nortel Networks Corporation, Global Software Delivery Division, Site Readiness Group; Research Triangle Park, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated December 7, 2007, 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 the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on November 8, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on November 21, 2007 (72 FR 65607).

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 mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The negative TAA determination issued by the Department for workers of Nortel Networks Corporation, Global Software Delivery Division, Site Readiness Group, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm monitored customer's hardware in preparation for software upgrades.

The petitioner contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of the facts and alleges that the company