

APPENDIX—Continued

[29 TAA petitions instituted between 4/16/12 and 4/20/12]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
81509	Parkdale Mills #30 (Workers)	Hillsville, VA	04/17/12	03/22/12
81510	Motorola Solutions, Inc. (Workers)	Schaumburg, IL	04/17/12	04/16/12
81511	Pemco World Air Services, Inc. (Union)	Dothan, AL	04/17/12	04/16/12
81512	Ryder Systems (Company)	Shreveport, LA	04/18/12	04/17/12
81513	HSS—MMS, LLC (Company)	Shreveport, LA	04/18/12	04/17/12
81514	Veolia Environmental Services (Company)	Shreveport, LA	04/18/12	04/17/12
81515	General Security Systems working on-site at Smurft-Stone Corporation (Workers).	Ontonagon, MI	04/18/12	04/12/12
81516	Flo-Pro Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Bedford, NH	04/18/12	04/17/12
81517	Lane Furniture, Inc. (Workers)	Tupelo, MS	04/19/12	04/04/12
81518	Maersk Agency USA, Inc. (Company)	Madison, NJ	04/19/12	04/13/12
81519	Appleton Papers (Company)	West Carrollton, OH	04/19/12	04/16/12
81520	T-Mobile USA Inc. (Union)	7 facilities in PA, FL, TX, KS, CO, & OR—follow-up email will specify, WA.	04/19/12	04/17/12
81521	Journal Register East (Workers)	New Haven, CT	04/19/12	04/09/12
81522	Pittsburgh Glass Works (Workers)	Pittsburgh, PA	04/20/12	04/19/12
81523	Dameron Alloy Foundries (State/One-Stop)	Compton, CA	04/20/12	04/19/12
81524	FT Material Solutions, Inc. (Company)	Fairview, OR	04/20/12	04/17/12

[FR Doc. 2012-11051 Filed 5-7-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-80,485]

R.R. Donnelley, Inc., Bloomsburg, PA; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On March 1, 2012, the Department of Labor issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for workers and former workers of R.R. Donnelley, Inc., Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania (subject firm). The Department's Notice of affirmative determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 2012 (77 FR 9972). The workers are engaged in employment related to the production of hard and soft cover books.

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 initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the

findings that the subject firm did not import hard and soft cover books, or articles like or directly competitive, during the relevant time period. A survey conducted on the subject firm's major customer revealed no imports of hard and soft cover books, or articles like or directly competitive.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioners claimed that worker separations at the subject firm were attributable to the subject firm's international operations and increased import competition of hard and soft cover books, as well as electronic books (e-books).

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department reviewed and confirmed information provided during the initial investigation and collected additional information from the subject firm and the surveyed customer.

The reconsideration investigation findings revealed that the subject firm has not shifted the production of hard and soft cover books to a foreign country and does not import hard and soft cover books, or like or directly competitive articles. The reconsideration investigation was extended to consider the trade impact from a shift of production or imports of e-books. The information revealed that the production of e-books by the subject firm takes place domestically. Additionally, subject firm's customer stated that it does not import e-books.

Based on a careful review of information obtained during the initial investigation and the reconsideration investigation, the Department

determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of R.R. Donnelley, Inc., Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, on this 27th day of April 2012.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2012-11055 Filed 5-7-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-80,454]

TMI Forest Products, Inc., Crane Creek Division, Morton, WA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 6, 2012, a representative of the Washington State Labor Counsel, AFL-CIO, requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of TMI Forest Products, Inc., Crane Creek Division, Morton, Washington (subject firm). The

determination was signed on February 17, 2012. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on March 6, 2012 (77 FR 13355).

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 determination of the TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at the subject firm was based on the findings that the subject firm did not, during the period under investigation, shift to a foreign country production of articles like or directly competitive with the fence boards produced by the workers or acquire such production from a foreign country. Additionally, the findings revealed that the workers' separation, or threat of separation, was not related to any increase in imports, by the subject firm or its customers, of articles like or directly competitive with fence boards; and that the workers' firm is not a supplier or a downstream producer to a firm that employed a group of workers who are eligible to apply for TAA.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that worker separations are attributable to increased import competition of articles like or directly competitive with the fence boards produced by the workers, to foreign competition of raw material used in the production of fence boards, and to the Canadian practice of using Bark Beetle affected timber. The documentation supplied by the petitioner included import and export data, news and opinion articles, printed web pages, and a copy of a certification of another fencing company (based on increased imports by that company's major declining customers).

The Department has carefully reviewed the petitioner's allegations and support documentation, as well as previously-submitted information.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination. Based on these findings,

the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application and 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.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 24th day of April 2012.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2012-11056 Filed 5-7-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification of Application of Existing Mandatory Safety Standards

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and 30 CFR Part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification. This notice is a summary of petitions for modification submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) by the parties listed below to modify the application of existing mandatory safety standards codified in Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

DATES: All comments on the petitions must be received by the Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances on or before June 7, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit your comments, identified by "docket number" on the subject line, by any of the following methods:

1. *Electronic Mail:* zzMSHA-comments@dol.gov. Include the docket number of the petition in the subject line of the message.

2. *Facsimile:* 202-693-9441.

3. *Regular Mail or Hand Delivery:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Room 2350, Arlington, Virginia 22209-3939, Attention: George F. Triebsch, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances. Persons delivering documents are required to check in at the receptionist's desk on the 21st floor. Individuals may inspect copies of the petitions and comments

during normal business hours at the address listed above.

MSHA will consider only comments postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service or proof of delivery from another delivery service such as UPS or Federal Express on or before the deadline for comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Barron, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances at 202-693-9447 (Voice), barron.barbara@dol.gov (Email), or 202-693-9441 (Facsimile). [These are not toll-free numbers.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (Mine Act) allows the mine operator or representative of miners to file a petition to modify the application of any mandatory safety standard to a coal or other mine if the Secretary of Labor determines that:

(1) An alternative method of achieving the result of such standard exists which will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners of such mine by such standard; or

(2) That the application of such standard to such mine will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in such mine.

In addition, the regulations at 30 CFR 44.10 and 44.11 establish the requirements and procedures for filing petitions for modification.

II. Petitions for Modification

Docket Number: M-2012-062-C.

Petitioner: Signal Peak Energy, LLC, 100 Portal Drive, Roundup, Montana 59072.

Mine: Bull Mountain Mine No. 1, MSHA I.D. No. 24-01950, 100 Portal Drive, Roundup, Montana 59072, located in Musselshell County, Montana.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 75.1002(a) (Installation of electric equipment and conductors; permissibility).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard to permit the use of nonpermissible electronic testing or diagnostic equipment in or inby the last open crosscut. The equipment includes laptop computers, oscilloscopes, vibration analysis machines, cable fault detectors, point temperature probes, infrared temperature devices, insulation testers (meggers), voltage, current, and power measurement devices, signal analyzer devices, ultrasonic thickness gauges, electronic component testers, electronic tachometers, total stations,