reasonably be considered like or directly competitive with the Sparta automotive headlamps that were transferred to Mexico. The two products are not substantially identical in their inherent or intrinsic characteristics, nor are they commercially interchangeable or substitutable. The aviation lamps made in Weatherly were very different in size and method of production from the automotive lighting produced in Sparta. *See* SAR 4, 18. Aviation lamps and automotive lamps are produced by very different processes. *See* SAR 21, 24. Aviation lamps are made by a very manual process. SAR 24. ''The lamp is extremely small and the assembly requires the use of a microscope. The automotive lamps are made of highly automated production lines and are of a much larger size.'' *Ibid.*

In view of the fact that the Weatherly plant, the plaintiffs' plant, was the only Cooper facility that produced aviation products during the period covered by the investigation and that Weatherly produced only those products during that period, I find that Weatherly was the appropriate subdivision for determining wheather a shift in production occurred. I have considered whether the automotive articles produced at Sparta were sufficiently similar to Weatherly's aviation products to warrant finding Sparta an appropriate subdivision. I conclude, however, that the products' differences in inherent or intrinsic characteristics, production process and commercial use preclude such a finding. I also note that the facts that the two plants that made these products belonged to different divisions of Cooper and that neither plant made components or finished products for the other provide additional support for my conclusion.

Two-Step Shift in Production

According to a vice president of Cooper, there was no relationship between the transfer of automotive products from Sparta to Matamoros, Mexico and the transfer of aviation lamp production from Weatherly to Sparta. *See* SAR 4, 18. The same official stated that the move of aviation lighting from Weatherly to Sparta could have happened even if Cooper had not moved any operations to Mexico; in his opinion, the two transfers were totally unrelated. *See* SAR 24. He also observed that the Weatherly production that was moved to Sparta was a very small lamp assembly operation, especially in comparison to the automotive lamp production in Sparta. *See ibid.*

Both in our initial investigation and in our remand investigation, the former Weatherly plant manager (who co-signed the plaintiffs' petition for administrative reconsideration, *see* AR 62) asserted that the plaintiffs lost their jobs because of the shift in production of automotive lamps from Sparta to Mexico. *See* AR Business Confidential Information (''BCI'') 5, 36; SAR 23. As noted above, however, a Cooper vice president flatly rejected this contention. When informed of the conflict the former plant manager's and the higher company official's views on this matter, Cooper told us that the plant manager had no responsibility for Sparta and that the vice president was more knowledgeable about Sparta's operations. *See* SAR 24.

I also note that, during the initial investigation, the former Weatherly plant manager gave us an inconsistent explanation of why his plant closed. At that time, he attributed the closing to the plant's loss of 80% of its capacity when it shifted its automotive line to another Cooper domestic plant in 1992. *See* BCI 36 (''The Weatherly plant is being closed because you can't support this size plant with what's left''). As noted earlier, a 1992 domestic transfer of production is not a ground for certifying workers who lost their jobs in late 1997 or early 1998 under the NAFTA–TAA shift-in-production criterion.

I conclude that the record does not support the theory that the plaintiffs lost their jobs because of a two-step shift in production form Weatherly to Mexico. The unrelated nature of the domestic shift of aviation lamp production from Weatherly to Sparta and the shift of automotive lamp production from Sparta to Mexico, and the great differences between these two product lines both refute the notion that a two-step shift in production occurred here. This conclusion is further supported by the finding of our original negative determination that the real cause of the plaintiff's separation was their employer's failure to procure avionics contracts that were awarded to domestic competitors. *See* AR 59.

Equipment Moved From Pennsylvania to Mexico

Notes taken during the initial investigation indicated that some equipment was transferred from Weatherly to Mexico. On remand, the Department queried Cooper executives and the former Weatherly plant manager about the company's equipment transfers. The former plant manager clarified his comments and stated that the only equipment Cooper moved from Weatherly to Mexico consisted of two large air compressors, which are not production equipment. *See* SAR 23. Two Cooper vice presidents stated that the company transferred no equipment from Weatherly to Mexico. Production equipment from Weatherly was either sold at auction or transferred either to Cooper's Liberty, South Carolina or Sparta, Tennessee facilities. *See* SAR 18, 24, 34.

Conclusion

After careful consideration of the results of the remand investigation, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA for workers and former workers of Champion Aviation Products, Weatherly, Pennsylvania.

Signed at Washington, DC this 17th day of August 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–22591 Filed 8–30–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–03247]

Procter and Gamble Paper Products Co., Greenville Plant, Greenville, NC; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 250(A), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), the Department of Labor issued a Certification for NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance on July 14, 1999, applicable to workers of Procter and Gamble Paper Products Co., Greenville Plant, Greenville, North Carolina engaged in the assembly of feminine hygiene products. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1999 (64 FR 43725).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that the Department incorrectly limited the certification to ''all workers engaged in employment related to the assembly of feminine hygiene products.''

The intent of the Department's certification is to include ''all workers'' of Procter and Gamble Paper Products Co., Greenville Plant, Greenville, North Carolina adversely affected by increased imports from Canada.

The Department is amending the certification determination to correctly identify the worker group to read ''all workers.''

The amended notice applicable to NAFTA–03247 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Procter and Gamble Paper Products Co., Greenville Plant, Greenville, North Carolina who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 9, 1998, through July 14, 2001 are eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of August, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–22592 Filed 8–30–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

NAFTA—03015; Quest Petroleum Corporation, Reno, Nevada; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on March 22, 1999 in response to a worker petition which was dated March 1, 1999, and filed on behalf of workers at Quest Petroleum Corporation, Reno, Nevada.

The Department of Labor has determined that the petition is invalid. Under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, a NAFTA–TAA petition may be filed by a group of three or more workers in an appropriate subdivision of a firm, by a company official, by their union, or other duly authorized representative, including community-based organizations. The petition was signed by one petitioner who is not authorized to file on behalf of all workers of the company. Consequently, further investigation in this matter would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 11th day of August, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–22579 Filed 8–30–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Records Schedules for Electronic Copies Previously Covered by General Records Schedule 20; Availability and Request for Comments

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration, Office of Records Services—Washington, DC.

ACTION: Notice of availability of proposed records schedules; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) publishes notice at least once monthly of certain Federal agency requests for records disposition authority (records schedules). Once approved by NARA, records schedules provide mandatory instructions on what happens to records when no longer needed for current Government business. They authorize the preservation of records of continuing value in the National Archives of the United States and the destruction, after a specified period, of records lacking administrative, legal, research, or other value. Notice is published for records schedules in which agencies propose to destroy records not previously authorized for disposal or reduce the retention period of records already authorized for disposal.

This request for comments pertains solely to schedules for electronic copies of records created using word processing and electronic mail where the recordkeeping copies are already scheduled. (Electronic copies are records created using word processing or electronic mail software that remain in storage on the computer system after the recordkeeping copies are produced.)

These records were previously approved for disposal under General Records Schedule 20, Items 13 and 14. Pursuant to NARA Bulletin 99–04, agencies must submit schedules for the electronic copies associated with program records and administrative records not covered by the General Records Schedules. NARA invites public comments on such records schedules, as required by 44 U.S.C. 3303a(a). To facilitate review of these schedules, their availability for comment is announced in **Federal Register** notices separate from those used for other records disposition schedules.

DATES: Requests for copies must be received in writing on or before October 15, 1999. On request, NARA will send a copy of the schedule. NARA staff usually prepare appraisal memorandums concerning a proposed schedule. These, too, may be requested. Requesters will be given 30 days to submit comments.

Some schedules submitted in accordance with NARA Bulletin 99–04 group records by program, function, or organizational element. These schedules do not include descriptions at the file series level, but, instead, provide citations to previously approved schedules or agency records disposition manuals (see Supplementary Information section of this notice). To facilitate review of such disposition requests, previously approved schedules or manuals that are cited may be requested in addition to schedules for the electronic copies. NARA will provide the first 100 pages at no cost. NARA may charge $.20 per page for additional copies. These materials also may be examined at no cost at the National Archives at College Park (8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD).

ADDRESSES: To request a copy of any records schedule identified in this notice, write to the Life Cycle Management Division (NWML), National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740–6001. Requests also may be transmitted by FAX to 301–713–6852 or by e-mail to records.mgt@ arch2.nara.gov.

Requesters must cite the control number, which appears in parentheses after the name of the agency which submitted the schedule, and must provide a mailing address. Those who desire appraisal reports and/or copies of previously approved schedules or manuals should so indicate in their request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marie Allen, Director, Life Cycle Management Division (NWML), National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740–6001. Telephone: (301) 713–7110. E-mail: records.mgt@arch2.nara.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Each year Federal agencies create billions of records on paper, film, magnetic tape, and other media. To control this accumulation, agency records managers prepare schedules proposing retention periods for records and submit these schedules for NARA approval, using the Standard Form (SF) 115, Request for Records Disposition Authority. These schedules provide for the timely transfer into the National Archives of historically valuable records and authorize the disposal of all other records after the agency no longer needs the records to conduct its business.