DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: Drug **Operations Section**, Domestic Drug Unit (ODOD) and must be filed no later than 60 days from publication.

Dated: March 14, 2003.

#### Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration

[FR Doc. 03-7827 Filed 4-1-03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

#### **Drug Enforcement Administration**

# Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By notice dated June 24, 2002, and published in the Federal Register on Ĵuly 10, 2002 (67 FR 45765), Stepan Company, Natural Products Department, 100 W. Hunter Avenue, Maywood, New Jersey 07607, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Cocaine (9041)	
Benzoylecgonine (9180)	

The firm plans to manufacture bulk controlled substances for distribution to its customers.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in title 21, United States Code, section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Stepan Company to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Stepan Company on a regular basis to ensure that the company's continued registration is consistent with the public interest. These investigations have included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with State and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that

the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed above is granted.

#### Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration. [FR Doc. 03-7836 Filed 7-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### **Employment and Training** Administration

[TA-W-41,831 and NAFTA-06338]

### Metaldyne, Inc., Formerly Accura Tool & Mold Co., Inc., Crystal Lake, IL; Notice of Negative Determination **Regarding Application for** Reconsideration

By application of December 18, 2002 (postmark date), a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) under petition TA-W-41,831 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) under petition NAFTA-6338. The TAA and NAFTA-TAA denial notices applicable to workers of Metaldyne, Inc., formerly Accura Tool & Mold Co., Inc., Crystal Lake, Illinois were signed on November 22, 2002, and November 25, 2002, and published in the Federal Register on December 23, 2002 (67 FR 78257 and 78258, respectively).

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 TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Metaldyne, Inc., formerly Accura Tool & Mold Co., Inc., Crystal Lake, Illinois, was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. Most of the molds and dies manufactured at Crystal Lake were sent internally within the subject corporation. Only a relatively minor amount of the plastics operation was supplied to outside customers. Accura Tool & Mold Co., Inc/Metaldyne Inc. did not increase imports of automotive transmission and powertrain molds and dies from 2000 through July 2002 when the plant shut down. Production of metal moldings was transferred to another affiliated domestic facility. The plastics operation was abandoned due to the closure of the plant.

The NAFTA-TAA petition for the same worker group was denied because criteria (3) and (4) of the group eligibility requirements in paragraph (a)(1) of section 250 of the Trade Act, as amended, were not met. There was no shift in production from the workers' firm to Mexico or Canada during the relevant period. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to worker separations. The factors as addressed in the TAA denial were also discussed in the NAFTA decision.

The petitioner appears to indicate that the Department of Labor made errors in the description of the type of work that was done at the Accura Tool & Mold Co., Inc./Metaldyne plant. When contacted, the petitioner clarified that he suspected that the petitioning worker group produced more than just molds and dies for components other than powertrains and transmissions, as the workers were not always informed about the end use of their production.

A review of the data supplied in the initial investigation and recent follow up contact with the company indicates that the subject plant primarily produced powertrain and transmission molds and dies. The subject firm also produced plastic molds, but this constituted a relatively small portion of overall plant production.

The petitioner also alleged that there were "errors in the correlation of definitions of what Metaldyne's description and functions of Accura Tool and Die were." The petitioner also attached various documents in an attempt to depict the allegation. When contacted for clarification on this allegation, the petitioner stated that workers skilled in mold and die production can produce molds and dies for a wide variety of metal parts. He also asserted that any mold and die facility had workers that could easily produce products competitive with those produced at the subject firm, and that there were many cheaper facilities in Mexico and Canada capable of this production. It appears that he believes that, if the high transferability of the petitioning worker group's skills were