

subject firm, and not Delta Air Lines, paid the subject worker group. SAR 19, 27.

Issues on Remand

The Plaintiff alleged in the complaint to the USCIT that the decline in travel in the Fort Smith, Arkansas area is attributable to a reduction in the operations of local firms that employed workers eligible to apply for TAA, and that this decline contributed to worker separations at the subject firm.

Because there is no dispute that a significant proportion or number of workers of the subject firm was separated, the only issues for the Department to decide on remand are whether or not the remaining two criteria of Section 222(c) of the Act have been met. Specifically, the Department must determine whether or not the subject firm meets the requirements of a “downstream producer” under Sections 222(c) and (d) of the Act and, if so, whether or not the loss of business by the subject firm with a primary firm contributed importantly to the subject worker group separations or threat of separations.

The investigations revealed that the services supplied by the subject firm were provided under contract exclusively for Delta Air Lines, AR 14, 24–25, 27–28, 33–34, SAR 3, 19, 21, 27, but that the subject worker group worked for the subject firm and not for Delta Air Lines. SAR 19, 27. Delta Air Lines was the sole customer of the subject firm. SAR 3, 21, 27. The Fort Smith, Arkansas airport users such as leisure travelers, travel agencies, corporate accounts, and the military may have benefited from the services supplied by the subject firm, and one or more of these entities may have employed workers who are eligible to apply for TAA. However, workers and former workers of Delta Air Lines at Fort Smith, Arkansas airport are not eligible to apply for TAA. SAR 32–33.

Section 222(d)(3)(A) of the Act requires that a “downstream producer” perform “additional, value-added production processes or services directly for another firm for articles or services with respect to which a group of workers in such other firm has been certified under subsection (a) [of Section 222 of the Act].” Section 222(d)(3)(B) includes “transportation services” among those services.

The subject firm cannot meet the statutory definition of a “downstream producer” because it only directly provided services to Delta Air Lines (not for the customers of Delta Air Lines). SAR 3, 21, 27. The subject firm did not supply services directly related to the

production or supply of an article or service that was a basis for a TAA certification. SAR 32–33.

Moreover, Section 222(c)(2) of the Act does not permit secondary worker certification unless the service provided by the subject firm “is related to the article or service that was the basis for such certification [under Section 222(a) of the Act].” Certification of a worker group under Section 222(c) of the Act may not be based on a secondary worker certification. Therefore, even if Delta Air Lines workers could be certified eligible to apply for TAA on the basis that Delta Air Lines provided transportation services related to the production or supply of an article or service that was a basis for a TAA certification of one or more of its customers, workers of the subject firm may not be certified as adversely affected secondary workers.

The Plaintiff also alleged that the domestic merger between Delta Air Lines and Northwest Airlines shows trade impact that resulted in the worker group layoffs.

The Department investigated this allegation during the remand investigation, and confirmed that worker separations at the subject firm are attributable to Delta Air Lines ceasing operations out of the Fort Smith, Arkansas airport. SAR 3, 19, 21, 27. However, the newly-merged airline maintained operations out of the Fort Smith, Arkansas location using a different airline customer service provider. SAR 3, 19, 21, 27. Further, those services provided by the subject firm cannot be imported or shifted abroad as they are used directly by domestic passengers. As such, conducting a survey of Delta Air Lines to determine whether it increased its imports of services like or directly competitive with those supplied by the subject firm (as requested by Plaintiff’s counsel) is not necessary.

Based on a careful review of previously-submitted information and new information obtained during the remand investigation, the Department determines that the petitioning workers have not met the eligibility criteria of Section 222(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Conclusion

After careful reconsideration, I affirm the original negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Atlantic Southeast Airlines, a Subsidiary of Skywest, Inc., Airport Customer Division, including on-site leased workers of Delta Global Services, Inc., Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Signed at Washington, DC this 3rd day of September, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010–23497 Filed 9–20–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–72,673]

Weather Shield Manufacturing, Medford, WI; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated August 12, 2010, the petitioners 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 Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc., Medford, Wisconsin (subject firm). The negative determination was signed on July 16, 2010. The Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on August 2, 2010 (75 FR 45163). The petitioning worker group provides administrative support services related to the production of doors and windows at various Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc. facilities.

Workers at Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc., Medford, Wisconsin, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 17, 2007 through August 9, 2012, are eligible to apply for TAA and alternative trade adjustment assistance under TA–W–64,725.

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 applicable to workers and former 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 services like or directly competitive with those supplied by the workers or

acquire these services from a foreign country; that the workers' separation, or threat of separation, was not related to any increase in imports of like or directly competitive services; and that the workers did not supply a service that was directly used in the production of an article or the supply of service by a firm that employed a worker group that is eligible to apply for TAA based on the aforementioned article or service.

Additionally, the Department surveyed the subject firm's major declining customers regarding their purchases of doors and/or windows. The customer survey revealed that customer imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm declined in the relevant time period, both in absolute terms and relative to the purchases of such articles from the subject firm.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner states that "Case number TA-W-72,673 is the same company and division as petition TA-64,725—Weather Shield Employees."

The petition date of TA-W-64,725 is December 17, 2008. The petition date of TA-W-72,673 is October 23, 2009. Because the investigation periods in the two cases are different, the findings in TA-W-64,725 cannot be used as the basis for a certification of TA-W-72,673.

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.

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

Conclusion

After 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 10th day of September, 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-23502 Filed 9-20-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (10-112)]

NASA Advisory Council; Planetary Science Subcommittee; Supporting Research and Technology Working Group; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the Supporting Research and Technology Working Group of the Planetary Science Subcommittee of the NASA Advisory Council.

DATED: Wednesday, October 13, 2010, 9 a.m.–3 p.m., Local Time.

ADDRESSES: NASA Headquarters, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC, Room 1Q39 (9 a.m.–3 p.m. EST).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Michael New, Planetary Science Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Headquarters, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546, 202/358-1766; michael.h.new@nasa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda topics for the meeting will include:

- Presentation of Working Group Process.
- Discussion of Role of NASA HQ Program Officers.

This meeting will be held in room 1Q39 on the 1st floor of NASA Headquarters located at 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546. All visitors will need to sign in and show valid government-issued picture identification such as driver's license or passport to enter NASA Headquarters. Foreign nationals attending this meeting will be required to provide a copy of their passport, visa, or green card in addition to providing the following information no less than 10 working days prior to the meeting: Full name; gender; date/place of birth; citizenship; visa/green card information (number, type, expiration date); passport information (number, country, expiration date); employer/affiliation information (name of institution, address, country, telephone); title/position of attendee. The meeting will also be available via teleconference and by Web Ex. Any interested person may call the USA toll free conference call number 877-915-2770, participant pass

code 60186, to participate in this meeting by telephone. The Webex link is <https://nasa.webex.com/>, meeting number 991 907 278, and password R+AW0rk! (the fifth character is the number zero). For questions, please call Michael New at (202) 358-1766.

Dated: September 14, 2010.

P. Diane Rausch,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-23437 Filed 9-20-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-13-P

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

SUNSHINE ACT; NOTICE OF AGENCY MEETING

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Friday, September 24, 2010.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3428.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Consideration of Supervisory Activities (7). Closed pursuant to exemptions (8), (9)(A)(ii) and 9(B).

RECESS: 11:30 a.m.

TIME AND DATE: 2:30 p.m., Friday, September 24, 2010.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3428.

STATUS: Open.

Matters To Be Considered

1. Final Rule—Part 704 of NCUA's Rules and Regulations, Corporate Credit Unions.

2. Delegation of Authority, Corporate Credit Union Service Organizations.

3. Board Briefing, Corporate Credit Unions' Legacy Asset Plan Update.

4. Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement (IRPS) 10-2, Corporate Federal Credit Union Chartering Guidelines.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Rupp, Secretary of the Board, Telephone: 703-518-6304.

Mary Rupp,

Board Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010-23706 Filed 9-17-10; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE P