the decision document, the Department inadvertently included an irrelevant citation, 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B). Accordingly, the notice of negative determination on remand is amended to delete the reference to 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B).

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of September 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–24419 Filed 9–21–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,013]

Alcatel Telecommunications Cable Roanoke, Virginia; Notice of Negative Determination on Remand

On July 27, 2000, the United States Court of International Trade remanded this matter to the Secretary of Labor for further investigation in *Former Employees of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable* v. *Secretary of Labor,* No. 98–03–00540 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2000).

The Department's initial negative determination of eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance (TAA) for the workers and former workers of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable located in Roanoke, Virginia was issued on December 9, 1997 and published in the **Federal Register** on January 6, 1998, *see* 63 Fed. Reg. 577 (1998). The denial was based on the finding that criteria (3) of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)(A)(iii) and (B), were not met: *i.e.,* imports did not contribute importantly to the worker separations, and the company transferred production to another domestic location.

On remand, the court ordered the Department to undertake a full and complete investigation into the eligibility of former workers at Alcatel Telecommunications cable, Roanoke, Virginia to apply for trade adjustment assistance (TAA).

A complete investigation was undertaken, and the results of that investigation revealed that increased imports of singlemode optical fiber did not contribute importantly to the worker separations. Information provided by the company revealed that the company imports of singlemode optical fiber in 1998 were less than 2% of the 1997 production levels at the Roanoke facility. Further, a survey of Alcatel's customers who were purchasing singlemode optical fiber for the U.S. market revealed that those customers did not increase their reliance on purchases of imported singlemode optical fiber.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the results of the remand investigation, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Alcatel Telecommunications Cable, Roanoke, Virginia.

Signed at Washington, DC this 11th day of September 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Program Manager, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–24422 Filed 9–21–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–37,715; TA–W–37,715A]

Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, TN, and Mantachie, MS; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on June 20, 2000, applicable to workers of Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, Tennessee. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2000 (65 FR 45620).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that worker separations will occur at Murray, Incorporated's Mantachie, Mississippi facility when it closes in October, 2000. The workers are engaged in the production of bicycles.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers at Murray, Incorporated, Mantachie, Mississippi. The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Murray, Incorporated adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–37,715 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Murray, Incorporated, Lawrenceburg, Tennessee (TA–W–37,715) and Mantachie, Mississippi (TA–W–37,715A) engaged in employment related to the production of bicycles who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 11, 1999 through June 20, 2002 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 13th day of September, 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–24420 Filed 9–21–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of September, 2000.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–37,940; Cloverland Manufacturing, Inc., Escanaba, MI

TA–W–37,670; Berstone Knitting Mills, Brooklyn, NY

TA–W–37,753; Spray Cotton Mills, Nova Yarns Div., Eden, NC

TA–W–37,501; Stant Manufacturing, Inc., Plating Operation, Connersville, IN

TA–W–37,891; Acorn Window Systems, Quincy, MI

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

TA–W–37,826; Blastco Service Co., Oil Refinery Demolition Workers, Odessa, TX

TA–W–37,944; Chief Tonasket Growers, Tonasket, WA

TA–W–37,957; Miller Harness Co., LLC, East Rutherford, NJ

TA–W–37,973; General Motors Corp., Desert Proving Ground, Mesa, AZ

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–37,704; Fernwood Magnetics, Belvidere, NJ

TA–W–37,679; National Semiconductor, Die Products Business Group, South Portland, ME

TA–W–37,798; KPT, Inc., Bloomfield, IN

TA–W–37,871; Robinson Fiddler's Green Manufacturing Co., Inc., Springville, NY

TA–W–37,855; Graphic Vinyl Products, Inc., Newark, NJ

TA–W–37,948; Rock-Tenn Corp., Madison, WI

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–37,808; Edgewater Steel, LTD, Oakmont, PA

The investigation revealed that criteria (1) and criteria (3) have not been met. A significant number or proportion of the workers did not become totally or partially separated from employment as required for certification. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification. Increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive.

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name and location of each determination references the impact date for all workers of such determination.

TA–W–38,019; West Mill Clothes, Inc., Woodside, NY: August 10, 1999.

TA–W–37,931; Tri State Data Products, Feasterville, PA: July 24, 1999.

TA–W–37,756; NRV Manufacturing Co., Inc., Carollton, AL: May 27, 1999.

TA–W–37,955; J.A. Thurston Co., Inc., Rumford, ME: August 4, 1999.

TA–W–37,954; Brestl, Inc., High Point, NC: August 4, 1999.

TA–W–37,991; New Haven Industries, Inc., Lock Haven, PA: August 10, 1999.

TA–W–37,937; Wolverine Worldwide, Inc., Kirksville, MO: July 17, 1999.

TA–W–37,894; GT Bicycles, Inc., Santa Ana, CA: June 19, 1999.

TA–W–37,760; Marijon Dyeing and Finishing Co., East Rutherford, NJ: May 18, 1999.

TA–W–37,952; Ochoco Lumber Col, Prineville, OR: July 28, 1999.

TA–W–37,550; Lermer Aircraft Galley Equipment, Inc., Eatontown, NJ: May 25, 1999.

TA–W–37,968; Vesuvius Premier Refractories, Washington, PA: August 3, 1999.

TA–W–37,880; AII Technologies, Inc., El Paso, TX: August 21, 1999.

TA–W–37,714; Gambro Renal Service, Lakewood, CO: May 11, 1999.

TA–W–37,502; Leica Microsystems, Inc., Analytical Div., Depew, NY: March 17, 1999.

TA–W–37,807; Southern Trim, Inc., Opp, AL: June 9, 1999.

TA–W–37,963; Prestolite Wire Corp., Battery Cable and Battery Terminal Dept., Bristol, TN: July 22, 1999.

TA–W–37,913; United Filters, Inc., Amarillo, TX: September 11, 2000.

TA–W–37,746; N.N. Apparel, Inc., Mt. Vernon, NY: May 23, 1999, Hermitage, MO: May 22, 1999.

Also, pursuant to title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with section 250(a), subchapter D, chapter 2, title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the month of September, 2000.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) That imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases in imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA–TAA–03948; Spray Cotton Mills, Nova Yarns Div., Eden, NC

NAFTA–TAA–04068; Rock-Tenn Corp., Madison, WI

NAFTA–TAA–04035; Acorn Window Systems, Quincy, MI

NAFTA–TAA–03811; Stant Manufacturing, Inc., Plating Operation, Connersville, IN

NAFTA–TAA–04084; WP Industries, Inc., South Gate, CA

NAFTA–TAA–04099; Adirondack Knitting Mills, Inc., Amsterdam, NY

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

NAFTA–TAA–4063; RMH Teleservices, Inc., Sergeant Bluff, IA

NAFTA–TAA–04064; General Motors Corp., Desert Proving Ground, Mesa, AZ

The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 250(a) of the Trade Act, as amended.

NAFTA–TAA–03971; Edgewater Steel, Ltd., Oakmont, PA

The investigation revealed that criteria (1) and criteria (4) have not been met. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–04041; B.F. Goodrich Aerospace, Landing Gear Div., Euless, TX: July 14, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04057; Permair Leathers, Salem, MA: August 4, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04050; Prestolite Wire Corp., Battery Cable and Battery Terminal Dept., Bristol, TN: July 22, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04108; Parker Seal Co., Parker-Hannifin Corp., Berea, KY: August 11, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04065; Academy Broadway Corp., Sleeping Bag Div., Pine Knot, KY: August 4, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04119; Bulk Manufacturing Co., Plant City, FL: August 14, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04073; Smith and Nephew, Inc., Dynacast Extra Casting Dept., Charlotte, NC: August 11, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–4047; AII Technologies, Inc., El Paso, TX: July 12, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04069; Alaria Medical Systems, Creedmoor, NC: August 9, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04055; Melvin Quilting, Rocky Mount, NC: July 31, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04004; MNCO, LLC, (Formerly McGuire-Nicholas Co., LLC), Commerce, CA: May 23, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04040; VF Workwear, Inc., Red Kap Industries, Dickson, TN: July 20, 1999.

NAFTA–TAA–04123; Eastman Kodak Co., Precision Plastics Tech Center, Rochester, NY: August 11, 1999.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of September, 2000. 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: September 15, 2000.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–24421 Filed 9–21–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division

Minimum Wages for Federal and Federally Assisted Construction; General Wage Determination; Decisions

General wage determination decisions of the Secretary of Labor are issued in accordance with applicable law and are based on the information obtained by the Department of Labor from its study of local wage conditions and data made available from other sources. They specify the basic hourly wage rates and fringe benefits which are determined to be prevailing for the described classes of laborers and mechanics employed on construction projects of a similar character and in the localities specified therein.

The determinations in these decisions of prevailing rates and fringe benefits have been made in accordance with 29 CFR Part 1, by authority of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494), as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a) and of other Federal statutes referred to in 29 CFR Part 1, Appendix, as well as such additional statutes as may from time to time be enacted containing provisions for the payment of wages determined to be prevailing by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The prevailing rates and fringe benefits determined in these decisions shall, in accordance with the provisions of foregoing statutes, constitute the minimum wages payable on Federal and federally assisted construction projects to laborers and mechanics of the specified classes engaged on contract work of the character and in the localities described therein.

Good cause is hereby found for not utilizing notice and public comment procedure thereon prior to the issuance of these determinations as prescribed in 5 U.S.C. 553 and not providing for delay in the effective date as prescribed in that section, because the necessity to issue current construction industry wage determinations frequently and in large volume causes procedures to be impractical and contrary to the public interest.

General wage determination decisions, and modifications and supersedes decisions thereto, contain no expiration dates and are effective from their date of notice in the **Federal Register**, or on the date written notice is received by the agency, whichever is earlier. These decisions are to be used in accordance with the provisions of 29 CFR Parts 1 and 5. Accordingly, the applicable decision, together with any modifications issued, must be made a part of every contract for performance of the described work within the geographic areas indicated as required by an applicable Federal prevailing wage law and 29 CFR Part 5. The wage rates and fringe benefits, notice of which is published herein, and which are contained in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon And Related Acts,'' shall be the minimum paid by contractors and subcontractors to laborers and mechanics.

Any person, organization, or governmental agency having an interest in the rates determined as prevailing is encouraged to submit wage rate and fringe benefit information for consideration by the Department. Further information and self-explanatory forms for the purpose of submitting this data may be obtained by writing to the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division, Division of Wage Determinations, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room S–3014, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Withdrawn General Wage Determination Decisions

This is to advise all interested parties that the Department of Labor is withdrawing, from the date of this notice, the following General Wage Determinations:

SD000028 See SD000027
SD000029 See SD000027
SD000030 See SD000027
SD000031 See SD000027
SD000032 See SD000027
SD000033 See SD000027
SD000034 See SD000027
SD000035 See SD000027
SD000036 See SD000027
SD000037 See SD000027
SD000038 See SD000027
SD000039 See SD000027
SD000040 See SD000027
SD000042 See SD000027
SD000043 See SD000027
SD000044 See SD000027

Contracts for which bids have been opened shall not be affected by this notice. Also, consistent with 29 CFR 1.6(c)(2)(i)(A), when the opening of bids is less than ten (10) days from the date of this notice, this action shall be effective unless the agency finds that there is insufficient time to notify bidders of the change and the finding is documented in the contract file.