

manufacturer of any of these basic classes of controlled substances may file written comments on or objections to the application described above and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.43 in such form as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments, objections, or requests for a hearing 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: Federal Register Representative, Office of Chief Counsel (CCD) and must be filed no later than June 30, 2003.

This procedure is to be conducted simultaneously with and independent of the procedures described in 21 CFR 301.34(b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

As noted in a previous notice at 40 FR 43745–46 (September 23, 1975), all applicants for registration to import basic class of any controlled substance in Schedule I or II are and will continue to be required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1311.42(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: May 2, 2003.

**Laura M. Nagel,**

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

[FR Doc. 03–13314 Filed 5–28–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By notice dated April 11, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 26, 2002 (67 FR 20828), Salsbury Chemicals, Inc., 1205 11th Street, Charles City, Iowa 50616–3466, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of Amphetamine (1100) and Methylphenidate (1724), both Schedule II controlled substances. The firm's legal name has since changed to Cambrex Charles City, Inc.

The firm plans to manufacture amphetamine and methylphenidate for

distribution as bulk product 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 Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to ensure that the company's registration is consistent with the public interest. This investigation has 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 is granted.

Dated: May 7, 2003.

**Laura M. Nagel,**

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

[FR Doc. 03–13308 Filed 5–28–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of Disability Employment Policy

[SGA 03–08]

#### Home Modification Grants

**AGENCY:** Office of Disability Employment Policy, Department of Labor.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of funds; solicitation for grant applications (SGA).

This notice contains all of the necessary information and forms needed to apply for grant funding. (SGA 03–08).

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), the Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP) announces the availability of \$500,000 to award up to ten competitive grants in the amount of \$50,000 to \$100,000 each to provide home modifications as a means of further expanding the community integration of individuals with disabilities, and particularly those seeking employment. Grants will be awarded for a 12-month period of performance. After one year of support, it is anticipated that the grantees will have identified and developed the funds and resources needed to continue the

expansion of such home modification programs within their respective localities.

For people with disabilities and older Americans, an often-cited barrier to participation in work and community life is the lack of affordable home modifications, such as ramps, widened doorways, lowered countertops and cabinetry accessible to those who use wheelchairs. Such modifications can often mean the difference between working and being unemployed, between being a taxpayer and a recipient of public assistance, and between true presence and participation in one's community and living in a nursing home. In *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581, 119 S.Ct. 2176 (1999) (the “*Olmstead* decision”), the Supreme Court construed Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to require states to place qualified individuals with mental disabilities in community settings, rather than in institutions, whenever treatment professionals determine that such placement is appropriate, the affected persons do not oppose such placement, and the state can reasonably accommodate the placement, taking into account the resources available to the state and the needs of others with disabilities.

In *Olmstead*, the Supreme Court stated that institutional placements of people with disabilities who can live in, and benefit from, community settings perpetuates the unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable or unworthy of participating in community life. The Supreme Court stated that “recognition that unjustified institutional isolation of persons with disabilities is a form of discrimination reflect[ed] two evident judgments”: (1) “institutional placements of people with disabilities who can live in, and benefit from, community settings perpetuates the unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable or unworthy of participating in community life”; and (2) “confinement in an institution severely diminishes everyday life activities of individuals, including family relations, social contacts, *work options*, *economic independence*, educational advancement, and cultural enrichment.” *Olmstead*, 119 S.Ct. 2176, 2179, 2187 [emphasis added]. This decision affects not only all persons in institutions and segregated settings, but also people with disabilities who are at risk of institutionalization, including people with disabilities on waiting lists to receive community based services and supports. The President has made it very clear, through his New Freedom