

Human remains from Site X29SF17 consist of four individuals. Two adults and an infant were interred together just above the floor of the pithouse. One fragmentary scapula from a fourth individual, an older adult, was found nearby. No known individuals were identified. Cultural items associated with these burials were the remains of three dogs.

Site X29SF17 consisted of three structures: a pithouse, an associated surface room block, and a fieldhouse. Cultural materials excavated from the site include stone tools and debris, ceramic sherds, manos and metates, and faunal remains. Based on ceramic seriation, archaeologists estimated that the site dates to the Developmental Period, ca. A.D. 900–1100.

Human remains from Site X29SF7 include the extremely fragmentary remains of one individual. No known individuals were identified. No funerary objects were present.

Site X29SF7 consists of a pueblo with 26 surface rooms and one kiva. Cultural materials excavated from the site include flaked stone tools and debris, ceramic sherds, pieces of ground stone, and faunal remains, including bone awls. Based on ceramic seriation, archaeologists estimated that the site dates to the Coalition Period, ca. A.D. 1200–1300.

Human remains from Site X29SF10 consist of one tooth from 1 older adult individual. No known individuals were identified. No funerary objects were present.

Site S29SF10 consisted of a pueblo with 32 surface rooms and one kiva. Cultural materials excavated from the same site includes flaked stone tools and debris, ceramic sherds, and pieces of ground stone. Based on ceramic seriation, archaeologists estimated that the site dates to the Coalition Period, ca. A.D. 1251–1269.

Human remains from Site X29SF47, Agawano Ouinge, consist of one parietal fragment of one adult individual collected from the surface of the site. No known individuals were identified. No funerary objects were present.

Site X29SF47 consists of a large adobe-walled pueblo with three room blocks arranged around a plaza and kiva depressions. Based on ceramic seriation of cultural material from the site, archaeologists estimated that the site dates to the Coalition/Classic Period, ca. A.D. 1350–1425.

All the human remains from these sites are identified as Puebloan, and all are believed to be ancestral to present day Nambe Pueblo people based on the archaeological context of their collection or excavation. All four sites

are located near the Rio Nambe and Nambe Falls, approximately five miles from the present-day Nambe Pueblo, on Nambe Pueblo lands. The cultural affiliation of these individuals can be considered ancestral to the northern Rio Grande Pueblos based on the application of the Wendorf and Reed 1955 chronologic framework, as modified by Skinner et al 1980. Skinner et al concluded that the movement of Puebloan people into this area occurred sometime prior to A.D. 1200 and the population eventually was consolidated in the vicinity of the modern Nambe Pueblo.

Based on the above-mentioned information from these four sites, the Bureau of Reclamation's Upper Colorado Regional Archaeologist has determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10 (d)(1), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of seven individuals of Native American ancestry. The Bureau of Reclamation's Upper Colorado Regional Archaeologist has also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(A), the remains of three dogs listed above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, the Bureau of Reclamation's Upper Colorado Regional Archaeologist has determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these human remains and Nambe Pueblo.

This notice has been sent to the pueblos of Acoma, Cochiti, Hopi, Isleta, Jemez, Laguna, Picuris, Pojoaque, San Felipe, San Ildefonso, San Juan, Sandia, Santa Ana, Santa Clara, Santo Domingo, Taos, Tesuque, Zia, and Zuni. Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains should contact Dr. Signa Larralde, Regional Archaeologist, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation, 125 S. State St., Room 6107, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138–1102, telephone (801) 524–6292 #6 before March 4, 1996. Repatriation of these human remains to Nambe Pueblo may begin after this date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: January 26, 1996

Veletta Canouts

*Deputy Chief, Archeology and Ethnography Program*

[FR Doc. 95–2159 Filed 2–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–F

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Information Collection Under Review

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the Federal Register and allowed 60 days for public comment.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments from the date listed at the top of this page in the Federal Register.

This process is conducted in accordance with 5 Code of Federal Regulations, part 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to 202–395–7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to 202–514–1534.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency/component, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies/components estimated of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

The proposed collection is listed below:

(1) Type of information collection. Existing collection in use without an OMB control number.

(2) The title of the form/collection. Postgraduate Evaluation of the FBI National Academy Survey Booklet.

(3) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection. Form Number: None. Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

(4) Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract. Primary: State, Local or Tribal Governments. Other: None. This is program evaluation data collected to verify the appropriateness of courses offered at the FBI Academy to state and local law enforcement officers. Respondents are graduates of the FBI National Academy Program.

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond. 907 responses per year at .45 hours per response.

(6) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection. 680 annual burden hours.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: January 30, 1996.

Robert B. Briggs,

*Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 96-2219 Filed 2-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

## Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-39]

### Edward L.C. Broomes, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On March 27, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Edward L.C. Broomes, M.D., (Respondent) of East Chicago, Indiana, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AB2703925, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged that:

1. Information provided to DEA and the Indiana State Police by several confidential informants indicates that since 1989, [the Respondent has] written prescriptions for controlled substances to numerous individuals for other than legitimate medical purposes. These informants stated that a group headed by a James Marshall regularly drives to East Chicago, Indiana, from Pennsylvania, provides names to [the

Respondent] and/or [his] employees to be used on prescriptions, obtains the prescriptions from [his] medical office, fills the prescriptions at specific pharmacies in Gary, Indiana, and sells the controlled substances in Pennsylvania. The informants identified the drugs obtained as Desoxyn and Percocet, both Schedule II controlled substances. The informants also identified some of the names used by James Marshall in this scheme as Houston Abbott, David Abbott, Michael Johnson, Jason Brown, Beverly Abbott, and Patricia Armstrong.

2. [The Respondent] continued to write prescriptions for controlled substances in the names of at least two (2) individuals, Sean Abbott and James Quisenberry, for several years after their deaths.

3. Review of triplicate prescription records maintained by the State of Indiana indicates that between September 1989 and April 1994, [the Respondent] wrote prescriptions totalling over 6,600 dosage units of Schedule II controlled substances to the six (6) individuals identified by the informants. Many of these individuals obtained prescriptions for Desoxyn at least once a month for a period of over three (3) years.

4. [The Respondent] prescribed Desoxyn and Percocet on a regular basis to at least one (1) drug-addicted individual.

5. On December 22, 1992, eight (8) prescriptions issued by [the Respondent] were filled at a Gary, Indiana, drug store. Each of the prescriptions was for 400 dosage units of Dilaudid. None of the prescriptions contained a date of issue as required by 21 CFR 1306.05.

6. Many prescriptions written by [the Respondent] listed nonexistent addresses for the patients. For example, none of the addresses provided on the eight (8) prescriptions listed in the preceding paragraph was in existence as of October 1994. In addition, between January 1, 1993 and July 31, 1993, [the Respondent] wrote at least sixteen (16) prescriptions for controlled substances, including Percocet and Desoxyn, for James Marshall. The address provided on each of the prescriptions, 4930 Alden in East Chicago, Indiana, does not exist. Information provided by a confidential informant and corroborated by the Pennsylvania Bureau of Motor Vehicles indicates that James Marshall is a resident of Aliquippa, Pennsylvania.

7. On October 4, 1994, investigators executed a federal search warrant at [the Respondent's] office. The following violations were noted:

a. [The Respondent] had presigned controlled substance prescriptions for James Marshall in violation of 21 CFR 1306.05(a).

b. Patient files indicated that [the Respondent had] maintained narcotic addicts on methadone without obtaining a separate registration in violation of 21 CFR 1301.22.

c. Patient files revealed that [the Respondent had] prescribed Desoxyn, a Schedule II controlled substance, to treat obesity, in violation of Indiana law.

On May 30, 1995, the Respondent filed a reply to the show cause order, but he did not indicate whether he was requesting a hearing. On May 31, 1995, the Hearing Clerk sent a letter to the

Respondent, advising him that he had until June 14, 1995, to request a hearing, and on June 30, 1995, Chief Judge Mary Ellen Bittner issued an order terminating proceedings before her, noting that the Respondent had failed to request a hearing by that date.

Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator now enters his final order in this matter pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.54(e) and 1301.57, without a hearing and based on the investigative file and the written Reply submitted by the Respondent.

The Deputy Administrator finds that the Respondent is licensed to practice medicine in Indiana, and he has a Certificate of Registration with the DEA as a practitioner in Schedules II through V. The Respondent's registered location is the Lakeside Medical Clinic in East Chicago, Indiana. In February 1992, an investigation was initiated by the Indiana State Police because the Respondent had purportedly authorized an unusually large number of Schedule II controlled substance prescriptions according to information provided by the Indiana Health and Professions Bureau. DEA was asked to assist in this investigation, and it was found that the Respondent had issued prescriptions for Schedule II substances as late as April 1991, to an individual who had died on December 9, 1988. In his Reply, the Respondent wrote: "Attention has been drawn to the fact that two of my patients were receiving prescriptions of Ritalin although they had been dead for some time. I did not know of the demise until reading of it in the letter."

On October 5, 1994, a federal search warrant was executed at the Lakeside Medical Clinic, and presigned controlled substance prescriptions were found. Further, patient files indicated that the Respondent had maintained narcotic addicts on methadone, even though he was not registered to participate in such a program.

Further, two of the clinic's employees, as well as the Respondent, were interviewed during the search of the Respondent's clinic. The interviewing officer noted that the Respondent sometimes talked about matters unrelated to his questioning. Further, he was concerned when the Respondent appeared to fall asleep during the interview, although the Respondent assured him that he wished to continue, and the interview lasted only approximately one hour. The Respondent stated that during 1994 he had been in the hospital in January, August, and September, when he had remained for about 10 or 11 days. Further, the Respondent admitted to prescribing controlled substances to a known drug addict, stating that he