

petitioning worker group at Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Phoenix, Arizona (subject firm) did not meet the eligibility criteria of the Trade Act, as amended. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2014 (79 FR 8736).

The request for reconsideration asserts that the petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance was filed on behalf of the Engineering Department and that the scope of the initial investigation was too broad and, therefore, detrimental to the petitioning workers.

Based on information collected from the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation, the Department determines that the subject firm shifted to a foreign country the supply of services like or directly competitive with those provided by the workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I determine that workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona, meet the worker group certification criteria under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a). In accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., North American Division, Engineering Department, Phoenix, Arizona, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 29, 2012, through two years from the date of this certification, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on date of certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 29th day of April, 2014.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2014-11640 Filed 5-20-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-82,697]

#### **AT&T Corporation; a Subsidiary of AT&T Inc.; Business Billing Customer Care; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration**

On October 23, 2013, the Department of Labor (Department) issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of AT&T Corporation, a subsidiary of AT&T Inc., Business Billing Customer Care, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (hereafter referred to as "the subject firm"). Workers at the subject firm were engaged in activities related to the supply of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services.

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 was based on the Department's findings that there no increased imports, during the relevant period, of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by the subject workers; the subject firm has not shifted the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by the subject workers to a foreign country or acquired the supply of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services from a foreign country; the worker separations are attributable to a shift of billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services to other locations within the United States; the subject firm is not a Supplier to, or act as a Downstream Producer to, a firm that employed a group of workers who received a certification of eligibility under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a); and the workers' firm has not been publicly identified by name by the International Trade Commission as a member of a domestic industry in an investigation resulting in

an affirmative finding of serious injury, market disruption, or material injury, or threat thereof.

The request for reconsideration alleges that the subject firm has shifted billing services, ordering services, and/or customer support services to Slovakia, Mexico, India, and/or the Philippines. The worker requesting reconsideration also supplied additional information in regard to employment figures at the aforementioned locations and subsequently submitted multiple documents and attachments related to the afore-mentioned allegations.

During the course of the reconsideration investigation, the subject firm addressed the aforementioned allegations and confirmed the meaning of multiple documents and attachments provided by the worker requesting reconsideration.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department received information which confirmed that the subject firm has not imported, during the relevant period, any services like or directly competitive with billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm; the subject firm did not shift the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm, and; the subject firm did not acquire from a foreign country the supply of services like or directly competitive with the billing inquiry and billing dispute resolution services supplied by workers of the subject firm.

Additional information obtained from the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation revealed that the subject firm does not import any finished products that incorporate services like or directly competitive with the services supplied by the subject firm.

Therefore, after careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

### Conclusion

After careful review, I determine that the requirements of Section 222 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272, have not been met and, therefore, deny the petition for group eligibility of AT&T Corporation, a subsidiary of AT&T Inc., Business Billing Customer Care, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to apply for adjustment assistance, in accordance with Section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273.

Signed in Washington, DC, on this 7th day of May, 2014.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2014-11637 Filed 5-20-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-85,051]

#### **VEC Technology, LLC; a Subsidiary of J&D Holdings, LLC; Greenville, Pennsylvania; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated April 10, 2014, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance, applicable to workers and former workers of VEC Technology, LLC, a subsidiary of J&D Holdings, LLC, Greenville, Pennsylvania (subject firm). The determination was issued on March 21, 2014. The Department's notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on April 8, 2014 (79 FR 19385).

The workers' firm is engaged in activities related to the production of engine hoods, engine cover tooling, and parts for forklifts and drainage trenches.

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 Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) petition filed on behalf of workers at the subject firm was based on the Department's findings that the subject firm did not shift production of engine hoods and associated articles to a foreign country and that neither the subject firm nor its customers imported engine hoods and associated articles, or articles like or directly competitive, during the relevant time period.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner asserts that the workers of the

subject firm should be eligible to apply for TAA because loss of business that occurred prior to the relevant time period continues to impact the operations of the subject firm.

29 CFR 90.16(b)(3) establishes that the Department find "increases (absolute or relative) of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof . . ."

29 CFR 90.2 states "Increased imports means that imports have increased either absolutely or relative to domestic production compared to a representative base period. The representative base period shall be one year consisting of the four quarters immediately preceding the date which is twelve months prior to the date of the petition."

In the case at hand, the petition date is February 4, 2014. Therefore, "the twelve months prior" date is February 4, 2013, and the "representative base period" is January 2012 through December 2012. Consequently, imports during January 2013 through December 2013 must have increased from January 2012 through December 2012 levels for the Department to determine that the regulatory definition of "increased imports" is met.

The Department's investigation, which included an inquiry of both subject firm and customer imports, did not reveal increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm during the relevant period.

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 28th day of April, 2014.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2014-11642 Filed 5-20-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### **Notice of Availability of Funds and Solicitation for Grant Applications for Workforce Innovation Fund Grants**

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Notice of Solicitation for Grant Applications (SGA).

*Funding Opportunity Number: SGA/ DFA PY 13-06.*

**SUMMARY:** The Employment and Training Administration (ETA), U.S. Department of Labor, announces the availability of up to \$53 million in grant funds to be awarded under the Workforce Innovation Fund (WIF) grant program and anticipates awarding between 8-15 grants. These funds support innovative approaches that generate long-term improvements in the performance of the public workforce system, outcomes for job seekers and employers, and cost-effectiveness. All projects funded under the WIF will be rigorously evaluated in order to build a body of knowledge about what works in workforce development.

The complete SGA and any subsequent SGA amendments in connection with this solicitation are described in further detail on ETA's Web site at <http://www.doleta.gov/grants/> or on <http://www.grants.gov>. The Web sites provide application information, eligibility requirements, review and selection procedures, and other program requirements governing this solicitation.

**DATES:** The closing date for receipt of applications under this announcement is June 18, 2014. Applications must be received no later than 4:00:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeannette Flowers, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N-4716, Washington, DC 20210; Email: [Flowers.Jeannette@dol.gov](mailto:Flowers.Jeannette@dol.gov).

Signed May 14, 2014 in Washington, DC.  
**Donna Kelly,**  
*Grant Officer, Employment and Training Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2014-11778 Filed 5-20-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P**