TAA (TA–W–74,823 through TA–W–74,823G issued on November 22, 2010; TA–W–75,165 issued on February 28, 2011; TA–W–74,396 through TA–W–74,396C issued on December 29, 2010; and TA–W–74,149 through TA–W–74,149A issued on June 30, 2010).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c), administrative 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.

After the Act as amended in 2009 expired in February 2011, petitions for TAA were instituted under the Act as amended in 2002 (Trade Act of 2002). Because the immediate petition was instituted on August 5, 2011, the applicable statute is the Trade Act of 2002.

Section 222 of the Trade Act of 2002 establishes the worker group eligibility requirements. The requirements include either ''imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased'' or ''a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to a foreign country of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by such firm or subdivision.''

The request for reconsideration asserts that workers separated at The Hartford Financial Services, Inc., Hartford, Connecticut facility are similar to workers covered by ''other locations of The Hartford Financial Services, Inc. that have been approved.''

The certifications for TA–W–74,823 and TA–W–75,165 were issued based on the Department's findings that the workers' firm supplied a service and that the firm acquired these services from a foreign country. The acquisition of services that was the basis for certification under the Act as amended in 2009 cannot be the basis for certification under the Trade Act of 2002 because the two statutes have different worker group eligibility criteria.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, previously submitted materials, the applicable statute, and relevant regulation, the Department determines that there is no new information, mistake in fact, or misinterpretation of the facts or of the law.

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 at Washington, DC, this 14th day of September 2011.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2011–24470 Filed 9–22–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–80,147]

Travelers Insurance, a Subsidiary of the Travelers Indemnity Company, Personal Insurance Division, Account Processing/Underwriting, Syracuse, NY; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received July 18, 2011, a worker requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) applicable to workers and former workers of Travelers Insurance, a subsidiary of Travelers Insurance, a Subsidiary of The Travelers Indemnity Company, Personal Insurance Division, Account Processing/Underwriting, Syracuse, New York (subject firm).

The negative determination was issued on June 29, 2011. The Department's Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on July 29, 2011 (76 FR 43351). Workers of the subject firm are engaged in activities related to the supply of account and underwriting processing services for Traveler's Insurance.

In the request for reconsideration, the worker asserts that ''we were under the impression that our petition * * * could be merged or added as a supplemental to the Knoxville office petition (#75232).''

On August 31, 2011, the Department issued an amended certification applicable to workers and former workers of The Travelers Indemnity Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Travelers Companies, Inc., Personal Insurance Division, Customer Sales and Service Business Unit, Account Processing/Underwriting Unit, including teleworkers located throughout the United States reporting to, Syracuse, New York (TA–W–75,232A). The Notice of amended certification was published in the **Federal Register** on September 14, 2011 (76 FR 56819).

The Department has reviewed the application for reconsideration, the afore-mentioned amended certification, and the record, and has determined that the petitioning worker group covered under TA–W–80,147 is eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance under TA–W–75,232A. As such, the Department determines that a reconsideration investigation would serve no purpose.

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 at Washington, DC this 15th day of September, 2011.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2011–24480 Filed 9–22–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Notice of Opportunity To File Amicus Briefs

AGENCY: Merit Systems Protection Board.

ACTION: Notice.

Overview Information

Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB or Board) Provides Notice of Opportunity To File Amicus Briefs in the Matters of *Corry B. McGriff* v. *Department of the Navy,* MSPB Docket Number DC–0752–09–0816–I–1; *Alexander Buelna* v. *Department of Homeland Security,* MSPB Docket Number DA–0752–09–0404–I–1; *Joseph Gargiulo* v. *Department of Homeland Security,* MSPB Docket Number SF–0752–09–0370–I–1; and *John Gaitan* v. *Department of Homeland Security,* DA–0752–10–0202–I–1.

SUMMARY: These cases involve employees who were required to have security clearances and were