for workers of the subject firm. New information provided by the State shows that some workers separated from employment at Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company had their wages reported under a separate unemployment insurance (UI) tax account at American Protective Services. Workers from American Protective Services provided the security detail for the Wiscasset, Maine location of Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company. Worker separations occurred at American Protective Services as a result of decommissioning the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to reflect this matter.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company adversely affected by imports from Canada.

The amended notice applicable to NAFTA–01987 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Wiscasset, Maine and all workers of American Protective Services, Wiscasset, Maine that provided security detail for Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Wiscasset, Maine who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 21, 1996 through January 23, 2000 are eligible to apply for NAFTA–TAA under Section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 9th day of March 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–6729 Filed 3–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–02141]

Kered Clothing, Incorporated Manchester, New Hampshire

Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. 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 of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on January 20, 1998 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Kered Clothing, Incorporated, located in Manchester, New Hampshire. Workers produce ladies' sports apparel.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 17th day of February 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–6726 Filed 3–13–98; 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 February, 1998.

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–34,118; Tree Free Fiber L.L.C., Augusta, ME

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

TA–W–33,874; Altec Lansing Technologies, Inc., Milford, PA TA–W–33,937 & A; O.R. Technology, Inc., Boulder, CO and Campbell, CA

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

TA–W–33,882; Rockwell Automation/ Reliance Electric, Ashtabula, OH

TA–W–34,111; Rhone-Paulenc, Inc., Rasmussen Ridge Mine, Soda Springs, ID

TA–W–34,185; Oryx Energy Corp., Dallas, TX

TA–W–34,207; Tenneco Packaging, Clayton, NJ

TA–W–33,999; American Tissue Corp., Tomahawk, WI

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

TA–W–34,084; Hunt-Wesson, Inc., Fullerton Cannery & Distribution Center, Fullerton, CA

Layoffs were due to a corporate decision to consolidate operations and move production to other existing domestic company facilities.

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–34,197; Rittenhouse LLC, Imaging Supplies Div., Jefferson City, TN: January 13, 1997.

TA–W–33,910; Best Manufacturing Co., Inc., Salisbury, NC: September 25, 1996.

TA–W–34,215; Federal Mogul Corp., Powertrain Div., Greenville, MI: January 21, 1997.

TA–W–34,120; Alcoa Fujikura Limited, Electro-Mechanical Products Div., Owosso, MI: December 11, 1996.

TA–W–34,177; Paul Bruce/L.V. Myles, Scotland Neck, NC: January 8, 1997.

TA–W–34,186; Biljo, Inc., Dublin, GA: January 14, 1997.

TA–W–34,203; American Olean Tile Co., Lansdale, PA: February 26, 1998.

TA–W–34,217; Flour Daniel (NPOSR), Inc., Casper, WY: January 26, 1998.

TA–W–34,230; Wright Line, Inc., AutoCAD Department, Worcester, MA: January 30, 1997.

TA–W–33,154; American Metal Products, LaFollette, TN: December 15, 1996.

TA–W–34,125; Healtex, Inc., Warrenton, GA: March 11, 1998.

TA–W–34,028; Gentex Printing a/k/a General Textile Printing, Rock Mount, NC: November 11, 1996.
TA–W–34,181; Specialty Manufacturing, Bristol, TN: January 5, 1997.
TA–W–34,222; Koppers Industries, Inc., Woodward Coke Plant, Dolomite, AL: January 26, 1997.
TA–W–34,140; International Jensen, Inc., Punxsutawney, PA: December 19, 1996.
TA–W–34,090; United Steering Systems, Inc., Grabill, IN: November 20, 1996.
TA–W–34,021; Bosch Braking Systems Corp., Johnson City, TN: November 7, 1996.
TA–W–34,149; Zenith Electronics Corp., Purchasing Dept., Glenview, IL: January 2, 1997.
TA–W–34,025; Carter Footwear, Inc., Wilkes-Barre, PA: January 31, 1998.
TA–W–34,105; Struble & Moffitt Co., Isolyser Div., Runnemede, NJ: December 9, 1996.
TA–W–34,071 & A; Kessler Industries, Inc., El Paso, TX and Canutillo, TX: November 6, 1996.

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 February, 1998.

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 increased 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–02067; New Ponce Shirt Co., Inc., Ponce De Leon, FL
NAFTA–TAA–02095; National Electrical Carbon Products, East Stroudsburg, PA
NAFTA–TAA–012167; Metro Plastics Technologies, Inc., Columbus, IN
NAFTA–TAA–02122; Gentex Printing, L.L.C., a/k/a/ General Textile Printing, Rocky Mount, NC
NAFTA–TAA–02071; Weyerhaeuser Co., Coos Bay Export Sawmill, North Bend, OR
NAFTA–TAA–02127; Omak Wood Products, Inc., Omak, WA
NAFTA–TAA–02073; Hunt-Wesson, Inc., Fullerton Cannery & Distribution Center, Fullerton, CA
NAFTA–TAA–02033; Identity Headwear, Maysville, MO
NAFTA–TAA–02010; American Tissue Corp., Tomahawk, WI

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

NAFTA–TAA–02142; Computech Data Entry, Orlando, FL
NAFTA–TAA–02176; Pecos Valley Field Service, Pecos, TX

The investigation revealed that the 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–02052, A & B; Greenfield Industries, Inc., So. Deerfield, MA, Anaheim, CA and Greensboro, NC
NAFTA–TAA–02051; Koch Refining Co., St. Paul, MN

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) and criteria (4) have not been met. Sales or production, or both, did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification. There has not been a shift in production by the workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

NAFTA–TAA–02070; Fort James Corp., Packaging Div., Portland, OR

The investigation revealed that criteria (1) and criteria (4) have not been met. A significant number or proportion of the workers (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) did not become totally or partially separated as required for certification. There has not been a shift in production of the workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–02162; Seattle Gear, Inc., WA: January 23, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02152; American Home Products Corp., Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories, Bound Brook, NJ: January 21, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02150; Dexter Sportswear, Inc., Dexter, GA: January 23, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02160 & A; Sunrise Medical, Simi Valley, CA and Westlake Village, CA: November 19, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02046; Freeport Sulphur Co., Pecos, TX (Including Leased workers of Pecos Valley Field Services, Inc., Pecos, TX): October 24, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02020; Hood Lumber Co., Green Veneer, Inc., Div., North Santiam Plywood, Mill City, OR and Green Veneer, Inc., Idanha, OR: November 7, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02102; Spalding & Sons, Inc., Grants Pass, OR: December 16, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02097; Healthtex, Inc., Warrenton, GA: December 22, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02089; Newell Company Acme Frame—a/k/a Intercraft Harrisburg, AR: December 18, 1996.
NAFTA–TAA–02161; Glit/Gemtex, Inc., Buffalo, NY: January 23, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02136; Biljo, Inc., Dublin, GA: January 16, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02139; Scientific Atlanta, Tempe, AZ and Devau Resources, Working at Scientific Atlanta, Tempe, AZ: January 16, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02151; Flour Daniel (NPOSR), Inc., Casper, WY: January 26, 1998.
NAFTA–TAA–02185; Gambro Healthcare, Inc., Deland, FL: January 29, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02129; Hewlett-Packard Co., Printed Circuit Board Div., Vancouver, WA: January 6, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02181; MIJA Industries, Inc., Plymouth, MA: February 2, 1997.
NAFTA–TAA–02090; Farah USA, Inc., El Paso, TX: December 9, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–02194; New America Wood Products, Winlock, WA: February 10, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02154; Calgon Carbon Corp., Advanced Oxidation Technologies, Tucson, AZ: January 19, 1997.

NAFTA–TAA–02062; Criterion Plastics, Inc., Kingsville, TX: December 5, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–02166; SPM/Denver, A Dynacast Co., Denver, CO: January 28, 1997.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determination were issued during the month of February 1998. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–4318, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: February 27, 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–6740 Filed 3–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 98–10; Exemption Application No. D–10328, et al.]

Grant of Individual Exemptions; MS Commodity Investments Portfolio II

AGENCY: Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Grant of Individual Exemptions.

SUMMARY: This document contains exemptions issued by the Department of Labor (the Department) from certain of the prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (the Act) and/or the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the Code).

Notices were published in the **Federal Register** of the pendency before the Department of proposals to grant such exemptions. The notices set forth a summary of facts and representations contained in each application for exemption and referred interested persons to the respective applications for a complete statement of the facts and representations. The applications have been available for public inspection at the Department in Washington, D.C. The notices also invited interested persons to submit comments on the requested exemptions to the Department. In addition the notices stated that any interested person might submit a written request that a public hearing be held (where appropriate). The applicants have represented that they have complied with the requirements of the notification to interested persons. No public comments and no requests for a hearing, unless otherwise stated, were received by the Department.

The notices of proposed exemption were issued and the exemptions are being granted solely by the Department because, effective December 31, 1978, section 102 of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1978 (43 FR 47713, October 17, 1978) transferred the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue exemptions of the type proposed to the Secretary of Labor.

Statutory Findings

In accordance with section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code and the procedures set forth in 29 CFR Part 2570, Subpart B (55 FR 32836, 32847, August 10, 1990) and based upon the entire record, the Department makes the following findings:

(a) The exemptions are administratively feasible;

(b) They are in the interests of the plans and their participants and beneficiaries; and

(c) They are protective of the rights of the participants and beneficiaries of the plans.

MS Commodity Investments Portfolio II, L.P. (the Partnership) and Morgan Stanley Commodities Management, Inc. (MSCM, collectively the Applicants) Located in New York, NY

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 98–10 Application Nos. D–10328 and D–10329]

Exemption

Section I. Covered Transactions

The restrictions of section 406(a) of the Act and the sanctions resulting from the application of section 4975 of the Code by reason of section 4975(c)(1)(A) through (D) of the Code,[1] shall not apply, effective April 3, 1996, to the acquisition or redemption of units (the Units or Unit) in the Partnership by certain plans (the Plans or Plan) that invest in the Partnership, where MSCM, the general partner of the Partnership, and/or its affiliates are parties in interest and/or disqualified persons with respect to such Plans; provided that the conditions, as set forth below in Section II are satisfied as of the effective date of this exemption.

Section II. General Conditions

This exemption will be subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in the applications are true and complete, and that the applications accurately describe all material terms of the transactions to be consummated pursuant to the exemption.

(a) Prior to the investment of the assets of a Plan in the Partnership, a fiduciary of such Plan (the Plan Fiduciary or Plan Fiduciaries) who is/are independent of MSCM and its affiliates must approve such investment.

(b) MSCM has determined and documented and will determine and document, pursuant to a written procedure, that the decision of a Plan to invest in the Partnership was and will be made by a Plan Fiduciary who was and is independent of MSCM and its affiliates and who was and is capable of making an informed investment decision about investing in the Partnership.

(c) The independent Plan Fiduciary of each Plan investing in the Partnership has retained and will retain complete discretion with respect to transactions initiated by such Plan involving the acquisition or redemption of Units in the Partnership.

(d) Neither MSCM nor its affiliates has any discretionary authority or control with respect to the investment of assets by Plans in the Partnership nor renders investment advice (within the meaning of 29 CFR 2510.3–21(c)) with respect to the investment of such assets.

(e) No Plan investing in the Partnership has acquired and held or will acquire or hold Units in the Partnership that represent more than 20 percent (20%) of the assets of the Partnership.

(f) At the time of any acquisition of Units by a Plan, the aggregate value of the Units acquired and held by such Plan does not exceed 10 percent (10%) of the assets of such Plan.

(g) At the time transactions are entered into, the terms of such transactions are at least as favorable to the Plans as those obtainable in arm's length transactions with an unrelated party.

(h) No Plan has paid or will pay a fee or commission to MSCM or any of its affiliates by reason of the acquisition or redemption of Units in the Partnership.

(i) The total fees paid to MSCM have constituted and will constitute no more than reasonable compensation, within the meaning of sections 408(b)(2) and 408(c)(2) of the Act.

[1] For purposes of this exemption, references to specific provisions of Title I of the Act, unless otherwise specified, refer also to the corresponding provisions of the Code.