DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on April 11, 2002, Applied Science Labs, Division of Alltech Associates, Inc., 2701 Carolean Industrial Drive, State College, Pennsylvania 16801, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Methcathinone (1237)	I
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475)	I
N,N-Dimethylamphetamine (1480)	I
4-Methylaminorex (cis isomer) (1590).	I
Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315)	I
Mescaline (7381)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400).	I
N-Hydroxy-3,4-methylenedioxy-amphetamine (7402).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylam-phetamine (7404).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymeth-amphetamine (7405).	I
N-Ethyl-1-phenylcyclohexylamine (7455).	I
1-(1-Phenylcyclohexyl)pyrrolidine (7458).	I
1-[1-(2-Thienyl)cyclohexyl] piper-idine (7470).	I
Dihydromorphine (9145)	I
Normorphine (9313)	I
1-Phenylcyclohexylamine (7460)	II
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
Phenylacetone (8501)	II
1-Piperidinocyclohexane-carbonitrille (8603).	II
Cocaine (9041)	II
Codeine (9050)	II
Dihydrocodeine (9120)	II
Benzoylecgonine (9180)	II
Morphine (9300)	II
Noroxymorphone (9668)	II

The firm plans to manufacture small quantities of the listed controlled substances for reference standards.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substance 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 Assistance Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than October 7, 2002.

Dated: June 28, 2002.

Laura M. Nagel,

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

[FR Doc. 02–19895 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on December 13, 2001, Johnson Matthey, Inc., Custom Pharmaceuticals Department, 2003 Nolte Drive, West Deptford, New Jersey 08066, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
Difenoxin (9168)	I
Propiram (9649)	I
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methylphenidate (1724)	II
Codeine (9050)	II
Oxycodone (9143)	II
Hydromorphone (9150)	II
Hydrocodone (9193)	II
Meperdine (9230)	II
Morphine (9300)	II
Thebaine (9333)	II
Alfentanil (9737)	II
Sufentanil (9740)	II
Fentanyl (9801)	II

The firm plans to manufacture the listed controlled substances in bulk to supply final dosage form manufacturers.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with 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: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than October 7, 2002.

Dated: June 28, 2002.

Laura M. Nagel,

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

[FR Doc. 02–19896 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–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 July, 2002.

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 sub-division 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–41,588; Osram Sylvania Products, Inc., Central Falls, RI

TA–W–41,580; Pacific Northwest Sugar Co., Moses Lake, WA

TA–W–41.559; Southern Button Industries, Inc., Rivera Beach, FL

TA–W–41,522; John W. Hancock, Jr., Inc. A Subsidiary of Roanoke Electric Steel Corp., Salem, VA

TA–W–41,516; Washington Mould Co., Washington, PA

TA–W–41,402; Instron-Satec Systems, Grove City, PA

TA–W–41,435; Imperial Holly Sugar, Hereford, TX

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

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

TA–W–41,572; RMH Teleservices, Inc., Scranton, PA

TA–W–41,000; Advanced Service, Inc., A Subsidiary of General Electric Appliances, Memphis, TN

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

TA–W–41,729; Liz Claiborne, Inc., Mt. Pocono, PA

The investigation revealed that criteria (1) has not been met. A Significant number or proportion of the workers did not become totally or partially separated from employment as required for certification.

TA–W–41,577; Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co., Microinternconnect Systems Div., Columbia, MO

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

TA–W–41,597; Waukesha Engine Div., Waukesha, WI

TA–W–41,578; Holophane, A Div. Of Acuity Lighting Group, Inc., Springfield, OH

TA–W–41,501; Carolina Brand Foods, Div. Of Tyson Foods Group, Holly Ridge, NC

TA–W–41,504; US Timber Co., Camas Prairie Lumber Div., Craigmont, ID

TA–W–41,540; Anvil International, Inc., A Subsidiary of Mueller Group, Inc., Henderson, TN

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–41,585; C and M Knitting Mills, Inc., Maspeth, NY: May 2, 2001.

TA–W–41,567; Vaughan-Bassett Furniture Co., Inc., Virginia House Furniture Div., Atkins, VA: May 7, 2001.

TA–W–41,561; Casco Products Corp., Bridgeport, CT: April 29, 2001.

TA–W–41,553; Astechnologies, Inc., Laminated Products Group, Monroe, MI: April 19, 2001.

TA–W–41,530; Martin Color-FI, Palmetto Spinning Yarn Div., Laurens, SC: April 12, 2001.

TA–W–41,514; Aladdin Industries, LLC, Nashville, TN: April 19, 2001.

TA–W–41,506; Ampco Metal, Inc., Milwaukee, WI: April 10, 2001.

TA–W–41,445; Quantegy, Inc., Opelika, AL: January 27, 2002.

TA–W–41,212; Ametek Specialty Motors, Hudson, WI: March 25, 2001.

TA–W–40,666; Loren Castings, Inc., Loren Industries, Hollywood, FL: December 4, 2000.

TA–W–39,253; Federal Mogul, Abex Friction Product, Salisbury, NC: May 3, 2000.

Also, 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), Subchaper 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 months of July, 2002.

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 increases 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–05674; Loren Castings, Inc., Loren Industries, Hollywood, FL

NAFTA–TAA–06066 & A; Motorola, Inc., Semiconductor Products Sector, MOS 5, Mesa, AZ, Semiconductor Products Sector, MOS 6, Mesa, AZ

NAFTA–TAA–06177; US Timber Co., Camas Prairie Lumber Div., Craigmont, ID

NAFTA–TAA–06202; Pacific Northwest Sugar Co., Moses Lake, WA

NAFTA–TAA–06136; International Utility Structures, Inc., Batesville, AR

NAFTA–TAA–06176; Northstar Aerospace (Chicago), Inc., A Div. of Northstar Aerospace, Inc., Formerly Derlan Industries, Inc., Bedford Park, IL

NAFTA–TAA–06188; Martin Color-FI, Palmetto Spinning Yarn Div., Laurens, SC

The investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

The investigation revealed that 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–06345; The News Group, Midwest Div., A Div. of Great Midwest News, LLC, Jackson, MS

NAFTA–TAA–06148; Stanley Furniture Co., Inc., Stanleytown, VA

NAFTA–TAA–06049; Jacobs Sverdrup, Amherst, NY

Affimative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

NAFTA–TAA–06157; Astechnologies, Inc. Laminated Products Group, Monroe, MI: April 19, 2001.

NAFTA–TAA–06264; Washington Garment Co., Inc., Washington, NC: April 29, 2001.

NAFTA–TAA–05795; Lakemont Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lakemont, GA: January 24, 2001

NAFTA–TAA–06158; Fayette Cotton Mill, Inc. A Subsidiary of Union Underwear Co., Inc., A Subsidiary of Fruit of The Loom, Inc., Fayette, AL: April 29, 2001.

#NAFTA–TAA–06325; Metso Minerals, Inc., Clintonville, WI: June 25, 2001.

NAFTA–TAA–06340; Solectron Corp., West Palm Beach Interconnect and C–Mac Microcircuits, West Palm Beach, FL: July 5, 2001.

NAFTA–TAA–06274; Meyersdale Manufacturing Co., Div. Of Elbeco, Inc., Meyersdale, PA: May 29, 2001.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the months of July, 2002.

Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–5311, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: July 26, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–19957 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–40,018 and NAFTA–05269]

Trailmobile Trailer, LLC, Liberal, KS; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked May 14, 2002, the petitioners 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–40,018 and North American Free Trade Agreement-Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA–TAA) under petition NAFTA–5269. The TAA and NAFTA–TAA denial notices applicable to workers of Trailmobile Trailer, LLC, Liberal, Kansas were signed on April 26, 2002 and April 29, 2002, respectively and published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35143 & 35144, 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 misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Trailmobile Trailer, LLC, Liberal, Kansas engaged in employment related to the production of dry freight and refrigerator trailers, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The investigation revealed that the subject firm did not import dry freight trailers and refrigerator trailers during the relevant period. The investigation also revealed that the predominant cause of worker separations at the subject firm was a domestic shift of production to an affiliated facility.

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. The investigation revealed that the subject firm neither imported dry freight or refrigerator trailers from Canada or Mexico nor shifted production of dry freight or refrigerator trailers to Canada or Mexico. The investigation further revealed that the predominant cause of worker separations at the subject firm was a domestic shift of production to an affiliated facility.

The petitioner alleges that since all (three) domestic company plants closed and the company maintains a production plant in Canada, it is only logical that subject plant production would have been shifted to the affiliated Canadian plant.

A review of the initial decision and further contact with the company show that subject plant production was shifted to Charleston, Illinois. Based on information provided by the company, the subject plant was designed to produce only refrigerated truck trailers and was the only company location to produce these products. The plant never reached full planned employment or production. The plant was built in anticipation of acquiring new customers for a fleet type refrigerated trailer. These customers did not materialize. For a short time, dry van trailers with insulated panels were built in Liberal in addition to refrigerated trailers in an attempt to bring some production into the plant. Production of the fleet type refrigerated trailers ceased as of January 12, 2001. Specialty refrigerated trailers continued to be built in the affiliated Charleston, Illinois plant. No subject plant production of refrigerated trailers was ever shifted to Canada. With the closure of the three domestic sites by the latter part of 2001, the refrigerated trailer production was eliminated by the company and not shifted to Canada. The dry van trailers (3–4 percent of plant production) accounted for an extremely small portion of the work performed at the subject plant and thus any potential imports of this product cannot be considered as contributing importantly to the layoffs at the subject plant.

The petitioner further indicated that the plant worked in concert with an affiliated plant located in Missisaugua (Toronto), Canada and that on several occasions the plant sent equipment used in the trailer manufacturing to Canada, such as a vacuum lifter for roof mounting. The petitioner also indicated that one of the plant's C-frames for hydraulic punch Huck units was also sent to Canada.

The Canadian plant did not produce the major product the subject plant produced (refrigerated trailers) and therefore the working of the two plants in concert is not relevant in meeting the eligibility requirements of Section 222 or Section 250 of the Trade Act. Also, any machinery shipped to Canada was used to produce products other than those produced by the subject plant, and thus are not relevant factors in meeting eligibility requirements of Section 222 or Section 250 of the Trade Act.

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 decisions. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of July, 2002.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02–19964 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–40,548]

BP Exploration Alaska, Inc. Prudhoe Bay, AK; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter of May 30, 2002, the company requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance applicable to the workers of the subject firm.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination issued on April 25, 2002, based on the finding that the workers of BP Exploration Alaska, Inc., Prudhoe Bay, Alaska did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act, as amended. The denial notice was published in the