confidentiality as it pertains to an aspect of a federal workplace ADR program. The first chapter discusses issues applicable throughout a dispute resolution proceeding. This chapter covers the various stages—before, during, and after the actual dispute resolution session—of a dispute resolution proceeding. The remaining five chapters discuss particular issues regarding confidentiality—*i.e.*, confidentiality agreements, record-keeping, program evaluation, access requests, and non-party participants.

Executive Overview of the Guide for Federal Employee Mediators: This document builds upon the 2005 Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators (''Model Standards'') issued by a joint committee of three major nationwide dispute resolution organizations, the AAA, ABA and ACR in order to establish for federal employee mediators ethical standards of conduct tailored to mediation practice within the federal government. It sets out the Model Standards in their entirety and accompanies those standards with Federal Guidance Notes that provide practical guidance for federal employee mediators. In particular, Federal Guidance Notes are appended to the Model Standards for ''Impartiality,'' ''Conflicts of Interest,'' ''Confidentiality,'' ''Quality of the Process,'' ''Advertising and Solicitation,'' and ''Fees and Other Charges.''

Executive Overview of the Guide for Federal Employee Ombuds: This document builds upon the February 9, 2004 ABA Standards for the Establishment and Operations of Ombuds Offices (''Ombuds Standards'') issued by the ABA in order to establish for federal employee ombuds standards of conduct tailored to federal ombuds practice. It sets out the Ombuds Standards in their entirety and accompanies those standards with Federal Guidance Notes that provide practical guidance for federal employee ombuds. In particular, Federal Guidance Notes are appended to the Ombuds Standards for ''Establishment and Operations,'' ''Independence, Impartiality and Confidentiality,'' ''Limitations on the Ombuds' Authority,'' ''Notice,'' and ''Executive Ombuds.''

Linda A. Cinciotta,

Director, Office of Dispute Resolution.

[FR Doc. 05–22349 Filed 11–8–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–EC–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *California Olive Ranch,* (E.D. Cal.) 2:05–cv–02205–LKK–PAN, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California on November 2, 2005.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against California Olive Ranch pursuant to section 309(b) and (d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319(b) and (d), to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendant for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into the waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring Defendant to mitigate the environmental impacts by purchasing mitigation credits at the Dove Ridge Conservation Bank and to pay a civil penalty.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Pamela S. Tonglao, Trial Attorney, United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 23986, Washington, DC 20026–3986 and refer to *United States* v. *California Olive Ranch,* (E.D. Cal.), 2:05–cv–02205–LKK–PAN, DJ #90–5–1–1–17457.

The proposed Consent Decree may be viewed at *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html.*

Stephen Samuels,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment & Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 05–22361 Filed 11–8–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby give that on October 31, 2005, a proposed consent decree in *United States and the State of Indiana* v. *Town of Newburgh,* Civil Action No. 3:05–CV–199–RLY–WGH, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana.

In this action, the United States and the State of Indiana sought injunctive relief and civil penalties under section 309(b) and (d) of the Clean Water Act (''the Act''), 33 U.S.C. 1319(b) and (d), against the Town of Newburgh, Indiana, for violations of section 301 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311, and the terms and conditions of the Town of Newburgh's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (''NPDES'') permits at the Town of Newburgh's wastewater treatment plant and throughout its sewer collection system. The Complaint alleges that the Town of Newburgh violated the Clean Water Act and its applicable NPDES permits by failing to comply with effluent limitations in its permits, discharging wastewater and raw sewage through unpermitted point sources, and failing to monitor specified parameters at the frequency required by its applicable NPDES permit.

The proposed Clean Water Act consent decree provides for injunctive relief consisting primarily of the Town of Newburgh's implementation of a written capacity, management, operation, and maintenance (''CMOM'') plan for the sewer collection system that the Town of Newburgh owns or over which the Town of Newburgh has operational control; the approved CMOM plan is attached to the proposed consent decree as Appendix A. In addition, the proposed consent decree acknowledges that the Town of Newburgh has addressed alleged effluent limitation and sanitary sewer overflow violations of its NPDES permits through the completion of several construction projects: (a) the elimination of Outfall 011 to Cypress Creek; (b) the major upgrade of the wastwater treatment plant's capacity from 2.3 million gallons per (''MGD'') to 4.6 MGD; (c) the provision of alternate power supply to the No. 5 (Triple Crown) and No. 8 (Old Plant) Lift Stations; (d) replacement of pumps and controls at the Old Plant Lift Station; (e) the construction of an new 18 inch gravity sewer connected to the Old Plant Lift Station; and (f) the closing and sealing of Outfall 009. In addition, the Town of Newburgh will pay a civil penalty of $56,000 to resolve the claims in the Complaint.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to *United States and Indiana* v. *Town of Newburgh,* DOJ Ref. #90–5–1–1–06644.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United

States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, 10 West Market, Suite 2100, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, and at U.S. EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604. During the public comment period, the consent decrees may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html.* A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, or by faxing a request to Tonia Fleetwood, fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–1547. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $18.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the U.S. Treasury.

William D. Brighton,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 05–22362 Filed 11–8–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–259F]

Controlled Substances: Final Revised Aggregate Production Quotas for 2005

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice of final aggregate production quotas for 2005.

SUMMARY: This notice establishes final 2005 aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). The DEA has taken into consideration comments received in response to a notice of the proposed revised aggregate production quotas for 2005 published August 5, 2005 (70 FR 45432).

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine A. Sannerud, Ph.D., Chief, Drug and Chemical Evaluation Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Telephone: (202) 307–7183.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 306 of the CSA (21 U.S.C. 826) requires that the Attorney General establish aggregate production quotas for each basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedules I and II. This responsibility has been delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by 28 CFR 0.100. The Administrator, in turn, has redelegated this function to the Deputy Administrator, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.104.

The 2005 aggregate production quotas represent those quantities of controlled substances in Schedules I and II that may be produced in the United States in 2005 to provide adequate supplies of each substance for: The estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States; lawful export requirements; and the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks (21 U.S.C. 826(a) and 21 CFR 1303.11). These quotas do not include imports of controlled substances.

On August 5, 2005, a notice of the proposed revised 2005 aggregate production quotas for certain controlled substances in Schedules I and II was published in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 45432). All interested persons were invited to comment on or object to these proposed aggregate production quotas on or before August 26, 2005.

Nine companies commented on a total of 21 Schedules I and II controlled substances within the published comment period. One company questioned the aggregate production quota for marihuana. Eight companies proposed the aggregate production quotas for alfentanil, amphetamine, codeine (for conversion), difenoxin, dihydromorphine, diphenoxylate, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, levo-desoxyephedrine, methadone, methadone intermediate, methylphenidate, morphine (for sale), oxycodone, pentobarbital, remifentanil, sufentanil, tetrahydrocannabinols, and thebaine were insufficient to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, research, and industrial needs of the United States, for export requirements and for the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks.

DEA has taken into consideration the above comments along with the relevant 2004 year-end inventories, initial 2005 manufacturing quotas, 2005 export requirements, actual and projected 2005 sales, research, product development requirements and additional applications received. Based on this information, the DEA has adjusted the final 2005 aggregate production quotas for alfentanil, cathinone, dihydromorphine, diphenoxylate, levo-alphacetylmethadol, levo-desoxyephedrine, methadone, methadone intermediate, oxycodone, pentobarbital and sufentanil to meet the legitimate needs of the United States.

Regarding amphetamine, codeine (for conversion), difenoxin, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, marihuana, methylphenidate, morphine (for sale), remifentanil, tetrahydrocannabinols and thebaine the DEA has determined that the proposed revised 2005 aggregate production quotas are sufficient to meet the current 2005 estimated medical, scientific, research, and industrial needs of the United States and to provide for adequate inventories.

Therefore, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 826), and delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by § 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and redelegated to the Deputy Administrator, pursuant to § 0.104 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the Deputy Administrator hereby orders that the 2005 final aggregate production quotas for the following controlled substances, expressed in grams of anhydrous acid or base, be established as follows:

Basic Class—Schedule I	Final Revised 2005 Quotas (g)
2,5–Dimethoxyamphetamine	2,801,000
2,5–Dimethoxy-4-ethylamphetamine (DOET)	2
2,5–Dimethoxy-4-(n)-propylthiophenethylamine	10
3–Methylfentanyl	2
3–Methylthiofentanyl	2
3,4–Methylenedioxyamphetamine (MDA)	15
3,4–Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (MDEA)	5
3,4–Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA)	17
3,4,5–Trimethoxyamphetamine	2
4–Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (DOB)	2
4–Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyphenethylamine (2–CB)	2
4–Methoxyamphetamine	5
4–Methylaminorex	2
4–Methyl-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (DOM)	2
5–Methoxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine	2
5–Methoxy-N,N-diisopropyltryptamine (5–MeO-DIPT)	10
Acetyl-alpha-methylfentanyl	2
Acetyldihydrocodeine	2
Acetylmethadol	2
Allylprodine	2
Alphacetylmethadol	2
Alpha-ethyltryptamine	2
Alphameprodine	2
Alphamethadol	3
Alpha-methyltryptamine (AMT)	10