

initial investigation concluded that there was no shift of production to Canada or Mexico and that imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations.

On April 30, 2001, the Department issued a Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for NAFTA-4357 and published the determination in the **Federal Register** on May 9, 2001 (66 FR 23732).

The petitioners alleged in the request for reconsideration that production equipment (180" press line and two single pot spot welders) was sent to an affiliated plant located in Mexico. Information provided by the company at that time indicated that while equipment, absent its use, was sent to Mexico, the equipment was not used and there was no production shift. The Department determined that the shift of production equipment, absent its use, was an insufficient basis for certification.

The petitioners appealed to the U.S. Court of International Trade, and on voluntary remand, the Department requested more information from the company.

In the remand investigation, the Department requested information regarding company imports of side panels. The Department determined that there was no basis to reverse the negative reconsideration determination.

In a second voluntary remand investigation, the Department conducted a survey of the subject company's major customer and asked the company to clarify the situation regarding the shift of equipment to Mexico and alleged shift of production to Mexico. The Department determined that there was no increased customer reliance upon import purchases and no shift of production to Mexico. Therefore, the Department did not reverse the negative remand determination.

On the current remand, the Department followed the Court's guidance in conducting its investigation, obtaining new and additional information, as well as clarification, from the company regarding the alleged production shifts to Mexico. Upon careful review of the new information, it has been determined that a significant portion of production of like and directly competitive products was shifted from the subject facility to Mexico during the relevant period.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on the current remand, I

conclude that there was a shift of production to Mexico of articles like or indirectly competitive with those produced at the subject facility. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Oxford Automotive, Inc., Argos, Indiana who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 4, 1999, through two years from the issuance of this revised determination, are eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA under section 250 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of November, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-29541 Filed 11-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Commission Meeting

AGENCY: Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Commission will hold its next public meeting on Thursday, December 4, 2003, and Friday, December 5, 2003, at the Ronald Reagan Building, International Trade Center, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. The meeting is tentatively scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on December 4, and at 8 a.m. on December 5.

Topics for discussion include: quality of care; payment adequacy analyses for hospitals, physicians, outpatient dialysis, ambulatory surgical centers, home health, and skilled nursing facility; and Medicare+Choice.

Agendas will be e-mailed approximately one week prior to the meeting. The final agenda will be available on the Commission's web site (<http://www.MedPAC.gov>).

ADDRESSES: MedPAC's address is: 601 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 9000, Washington, DC 20001. The telephone number is (202) 220-3700.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Ellison, Office Manager, (202) 220-3700.

Mark E. Miller,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 03-29517 Filed 11-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-BW-M

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Membership of the Merit Systems Protection Board's Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board

AGENCY: Merit Systems Protection Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the members of the Performance Review Board.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Nelson, Director of Policy and Evaluation, Merit Systems Protection Board, 1615 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20419.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Merit Systems Protection Board is publishing the names of the new and current members of the Performance Review Board (PRB) as required by 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4). Rosemarie Straight and Steve Nelson have been appointed as new members. P.J. Winzer will continue to serve as Chair of the PRB; Barbara Wade will continue to serve as member.

Dated: November 18, 2003.

Bentley M. Roberts, Jr.,

Clerk of the Board.

[FR Doc. 03-29446 Filed 11-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7400-01-P

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Administration of National Railroad Adjustment Board Functions and Activities

AGENCY: National Mediation Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Mediation Board (NMB) extends an invitation to interested parties to attend an open meeting with the Board and its staff on Friday, December 19, 2003. The Board meeting will be held from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. The meeting will be held in the Margaret A. Browning Hearing Room (Room 11000), National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th St. NW, Washington, DC 20570. During the public meeting, the NMB invites interested persons to share their views on the issues raised in the Board's Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) concerning the administration of National Railroad Adjustment Board (NRAB) functions and activities (68 FR 46983, Aug. 7, 2003).

DATES: The meeting will be held on December 19, 2003, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. Due to time and seating considerations, individuals desiring to

attend the meeting, or to make a presentation before the Board, must notify the NMB staff, in writing, no later than 4 pm on Thursday, December 11, 2003.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held in the Margaret A. Browning Hearing Room, (Room 11000), National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th St. NW, Washington, DC 20570. Requests to attend the meetings must be in writing, and must be addressed to Mr. Roland Watkins, Director of Arbitration/NRAB Administrator, National Mediation Board, 1301 K Street, NW, Suite 250—East, Washington, DC 20005. Attn: NMB Docket No. 2003–01. Written requests may be sent electronically to the following e-mail address: arb@nmb.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Roland Watkins, Director of Arbitration/NRAB Administrator, National Mediation Board (telephone 202–692–5057).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Mediation Board will hold an open public meeting on Friday, December 19, 2003 from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. The purpose of the public meeting will be to solicit the views of interested persons concerning the various topics and questions posed by the NMB in its ANPRM concerning the administration of National Railroad Adjustment Board (NRAB) functions and activities (68 FR 46983, Aug. 7, 2003).

Individuals desiring to attend the meeting must notify the NMB staff, in writing, at the above listed physical or e-mail address, by the deadline noted. If an individual desires to make a presentation to the Board at the meeting, he or she is required to submit a brief outline of the presentation when making the request. In addition, a full written statement must be submitted one week prior to the meeting (the deadline for this submission is Thursday, December 11, 2003 at 4 p.m.). In lieu of making an oral presentation, individuals may submit a written statement for the record.

To attend the meeting, all potential attendees must include in their request: (1) their full name and (2) organizational affiliation (if any). Attendees are also reminded to bring photo identification card with them to the public meeting in order to gain admittance to the building. Due to time and potential space limitations in the meeting room, the NMB will notify individuals of their attendance and/or speaking status (*i.e.*, preliminary time for their presentation) prior to the meeting. Time allocations for oral presentations will depend upon the number of individuals who desire to make presentations to the Board.

Individuals should be prepared to summarize their written statements at the meeting.

Agenda: The NMB, in particular, solicits presentations on the following questions that were posed in the ANPRM:

Question One: If the NMB promulgates procedures for the administrative processing of NRAB cases in which the parties request that the Government compensate the neutral (“referee”), what should be the criteria or guidelines for these procedures?

It has been suggested to the NMB, that a desirable goal is to have minor disputes resolved within one year of the filing of a Notice of Intent to File a Submission. At present, it is not uncommon for cases to remain unresolved for two years.

Question Two: If a stated goal of any new procedures to be adopted by the NMB is to have the cases decided by an arbitrator within one year from the date of the filing of the Notice of Intent, what steps do you recommend comprise this procedure? Do you believe that a one year goal is reasonable? If not, why not?

Question Three: If the parties do not agree to follow the procedures adopted by the NMB, should there be any adverse consequences? Should the parties have options with respects to these procedures? What would you recommend be the steps that comprise an efficient case resolution procedure?

Question Four: What should happen to those cases that are still pending after one year in which the parties have not placed the cases before a Public Law Board, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 153, Second? If the cases are placed before a Public Law Board, should a time limit be imposed for the resolution of those cases?

At present, the NRAB has approximately 2,000 cases pending before it. Many of these cases arise out of the filing of multiple grievances by different parties for the same underlying set of facts.

Question Five: In order to ensure the most efficient use of limited Government resources, should the NMB, in agreeing to pay for the appointment of an arbitrator (“referee”) require the consolidation of similar cases dealing with similar issues? If, in your view, case consolidation is a viable option for improving the resolution of cases, what should be the standards adopted for consolidation? What should the NMB do if the parties refuse to consolidate cases, when in the NMB’s view, it would be appropriate to do otherwise?

Question Six: As the goal of this initiative is to improve the processing of disputes before the NRAB, are there any

other recommendations or suggestions that you would make to the NMB with regard to its statutory responsibilities for the administration of the NRAB?

Roland Watkins,

*National Railroad Adjustment Board
Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 03–29496 Filed 11–25–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft Criteria for Determining Feasibility of Manual Actions To Achieve Post-Fire Safe Shutdown

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity for public
comment.

SUMMARY: The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering a revision to the fire protection regulations in 10 CFR part 50, appendix R, paragraph III.G.2 to allow the use of manual actions by nuclear power plant operators to achieve hot shutdown conditions in the event of fires in certain areas provided the actions are evaluated against specific criteria and determined to be acceptable. Currently, licensees who rely on operator manual actions which have not been reviewed and approved by the NRC are generally considered to be in non-compliance with NRC regulations. However, the NRC believes that manual actions relied upon by licensees are safe and effective when performed under appropriate conditions. Accordingly, until the fire protection regulations are revised, the NRC is planning to issue an interim enforcement policy to exercise enforcement discretion if licensees’ manual actions meet the NRC’s interim acceptance criteria. The NRC is seeking comments from interested parties on the adequacy and clarity of draft interim acceptance criteria which will be utilized by the interim enforcement discretion policy.

DATES: Comment period expires
December 26, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T6–D59, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Comments may be submitted by e-mail to nrcprep@nrc.gov. Comments may be delivered to the NRC’s headquarters at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.