- Crissy Field projects design briefing
- updates on Army environmental remediation at the Presidio
- updates on Presidio transportation planning
- report on National Historic Landmark designation for the Golden Gate Bridge
- reports on work of the Golden Gate National Parks Association
- reports on programs and projects of GGNRA ''Park Partners''
- updates on issues concerning management and planning at Point Reyes NS

These meetings will also contain Superintendent's and Presidio General Manager's Reports.

Specific final agendas for these meetings will be made available to the public at least 15 days prior to each meeting and can be received by contacting the Office of the Staff Assistant, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123 or by calling (415) 561–4633.

These meetings are open to the public. They will be recorded for documentation and transcribed for dissemination. Minutes of the meetings will be available to the public after approval of the full Advisory Commission. A transcript will be available three weeks after each meeting. For copies of the minutes contact the Office of the Staff Assistant, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123.

Dated: December 15, 1997.

Brian O'Neill,

General Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

[FR Doc. 97–33428 Filed 12–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Wildlife and Scenic River System: Ohio; Big and Little Darby Creeks

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Approval.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Interior hereby announces approval of an application by the Governor of Ohio to include additional segments of the Big and Little Darby Creeks, Ohio, as state administered components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angie Tornes, Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, 310 West Wisconsin Street, Suite 100E, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202; or telephone 414–297–3605.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the authority granted the Secretary of the Interior by section 2 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Pub. L. 90–542, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1273, *et seq.*) and upon proper application of the Governor of the State of Ohio, an additional 3.4 miles of the Big and Little Darby Creeks are hereby designated and are added to the existing segments of the Big and Little Darby Creeks, a state-administered component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

On March 25, 1996, the Governor of Ohio petitioned the Secretary of the Interior to add an additional 3.4 miles to the 85.9 miles of the Big and Little Darby Creeks, designated as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System March 10, 1996. The evaluation report for that designation, prepared by the National Park Service in September 1993, states that the additional segments now under consideration were eligible and would be suitable for national wild and scenic river designation once they were added to the State Scenic River System. The evaluation also concluded that these segments of the Big and Little Darby Creeks meet the criteria for scenic classification under the Act.

These additional segments were added to the Ohio Scenic River System October 3, 1994. Public comment regarding national designation of the additional segments was solicited in Ohio and the required 90-day review for Federal Agencies was provided. Public and Federal Agency comments support national designation of the additional Big and Little Darby Creek segments. The State of Ohio has fulfilled the requirements of the Act by including these additional segments in the Ohio Scenic River System. The State's program to permanently protect the river is adequate. Current State and local management of the river is proceeding according to the Big and Little Darby Creek Plan and Environmental Assessment submitted with the original application.

As a result, the Secretary has determined that the additional 3.4 miles of the Big and Little Darby Creeks should be added to the existing designation of Big and Little Darby Creeks as a state-administered component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as provided for in section 2(a)(ii) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Accordingly, the following additional river segments are classified as scenic pursuant to section 2(b) of the Act to be administered by State and local government:

Big Darby Creek: Scenic—From its confluence with Little Darby Creek (RM 34.1) upstream to the northern boundary of Battelle-Darby Creek Metro Park (RM 35.9) (1.8 miles).

Big Darby Creek: Scenic—From the U.S. Route 40 bridge (RM 38.9) upstream to the Conrail Railroad trestle crossing (RM 39.7) (0.8 miles).

Little Darby Creek: Scenic—From it confluence with Big Darby Creek (RM 0.0) to a point eight-tenths of a mile upstream (RM 0.8) (0.8 miles).

This action is taken following public involvement and consultation with the Departments of Agriculture, Army, Energy, and Transportation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as required by section 4(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. All comments received have been supportive.

Notice is hereby given that effective upon this date, the above-described additional river segments are approved for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System to be administered by the State of Ohio.

Dated: December 8, 1997.

William W. Schenk,

Regional Director, Midwest Region.

[FR Doc. 97–33427 Filed 12–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 97–11]

Ronald D. Springel, M.D., Grant of Restricted Registration

On January 28, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Ronald D. Springel, M.D., (Respondent) of Spokane, Washington, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated February 24, 1997, Respondent, through counsel, timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Seattle, Washington on July 15 and 16, 1997, before Administrative Law Judge Gail A.

Randall. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, both sides submitted proposed fundings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On October 6, 1997, Judge Randall issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, recommending that Respondent be granted a DEA Certificate of Registration subject to several restrictions that would remain in effect for three years from the effective date of the final order. On October 28, 1997, Respondent's counsel filed exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's Opinion and Recommended Ruling, and on November 6, 1997, Judge Randall transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Acting Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, except as specifically noted below, the Opinion and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge. His adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent graduated from medical school in 1978, and is currently licensed to practice medicine in the State of Washington. In 1981 or 1982, while practicing in Pennsylvania, Respondent became addicted to drugs. Respondent obtained controlled substances for his own use, by having prescriptions filled that he had issued in names of other than his own. On August 17, 1983, Respondent entered a plea of nolo contendere in the Lehigh County Court, to three misdemeanor counts of possession of a controlled substance and three felony counts of prescribing a controlled substance outside the course of his medical practice in violation of the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Respondent was placed on probation without verdict and was ordered to surrender his DEA Certificate of Registration. Consequently, Respondent surrendered his previous DEA Certificate of Registration on August 26, 1983.

On July 25, 1984, Respondent was convicted in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska, following his plea of guilty to two felony counts of attempting to knowingly acquire possession of a controlled substance by fraud in violation of 21 U.S.C. 843 and 846, and three counts of acquiring possession of a controlled substance by fraud in violation of 21 U.S.C. 843. The court sentenced Respondent to two years imprisonment with all but 75 days suspended, and then placed Respondent on probation for five years.

On August 31, 1984, Respondent was convicted in the Superior Court for the State of Alaska of four felony counts related to the unlawful handling of controlled substances and one misdemeanor count of making an unsworn falsification of an application for a temporary permit to practice medicine in Alaska. Respondent was sentenced to five years probation. Thereafter, on September 5, 1984, Respondent's application for a medical license was denied by the Alaska State Medical Board.

In 1984, Respondent underwent approximately 42 days of inpatient treatment for chemical dependency. Respondent then moved to the State of Washington, and in 1987, he suffered a relapse of his drug addiction, using drugs including heroin. During his relapse, Respondent was employed at a narcotic treatment program, where he unlawfully acquired approximately 35 milliliters of methadone, a Schedule II controlled substance. As a result, on August 26, 1988, Respondent was convicted in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington of one count of unlawful acquisition of a controlled substance in violation of 21 U.S.C. 843(a)(3), and was sentenced to one year imprisonment to be followed by two years of supervised release. In light of this conviction, on August 28, 1988, Respondent's probation based upon his conviction in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska was revoked and he was sentenced to three years imprisonment.

As a result of his relapse Respondent's license to practice medicine in the State of Washington was summarily suspended on March 4, 1988, by the Washington Board of Medical examiners (Washington Board). Thereafter, on August 1, 1988, the Washington Board revoked Respondent's Washington medical license and ordered that Respondent not petition for reinstatement of his license any earlier than 36 months from the effective date of the summary suspension order; that he successfully complete an inpatient treatment program; and that he remain drug and alcohol free for at least 12 months prior to his reinstatement. In addition, on September 27, 1988, Respondent's license to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was automatically suspended by the State Board of Medical Examiners due to his drug related convictions.

Respondent went to two different treatment facilities, entering the second facility on March 17, 1988. He has remained drug-free and in recovery since that date. Respondent testified at the hearing in this matter that he has developed a strong support system, and that he continues to regularly attend 12-step self-help group meetings. In addition, Respondent completed a five year contract with the Washington Physicians Health Program (WPHP) in 1994, which consisted of five elements: total abstinence from alcohol and any other addicting chemical; attendance at Alcoholics Anonymous and/or Narcotics Anonymous meetings; behavioral monitoring; chemical monitoring; and work site monitoring for the first five years under contract. After successfully completing his contract, Respondent has remained in the program on a voluntary basis, and was asked by the WPHP board to serve on the advisory committee, representing the rest of the participants in the program before the board.

In December of 1989, Respondent started a business which provided services to employers and employees to facilitate, among other things, compliance with drug-free workplace regulations. Over the years, this business endeavor has grown into six related enterprises which offer various services, to include employee assistance programs, occupational health services, drug-screen collection services, qualified medical review officers' services, and educational services to train employees and supervisors about the drug-free workplace regulatory requirements. The companies currently have approximately 2,000 clients in the Western United States, including the State of Washington.

On April 18, 1991, the Washington Board reinstated Respondent's license to practice medicine in the State of Washington with restrictions, including that he shall not obtain a DEA registration to handle controlled substances. On November 4, 1994, Respondent was granted an unrestricted license in the State of Washington, following the Washington Board's finding that Respondent ''is not a risk to the public in his practice as a physician. . . .''

At the hearing in this matter, numerous professional and/or personal associates and clients of Respondent either testified or submitted affidavits attesting to the high quality of services performed by Respondent and his companies; to Respondent's

distinguished reputation and character; and to their belief that the registration of Respondent to handle controlled substances poses no risk to the public or his patients. The Director of the WPHP testified that the chance of Respondent suffering another relapse is ''quite unlikely'' given that he had been drug-free and in recovery for over nine years at the time of the hearing.

Respondent testified that he is now seeking a DEA registration because he cannot fully perform the occupational health aspect of his businesses without being able to prescribe controlled substances. In addition, he wants to volunteer as the back-up physician at a local narcotic treatment program, and would need to be able to handle controlled substances to effectively perform his duties. Finally, he believes that being granted a DEA Certificate of Registration would make him a complete physician and would recognize the fact that he is a ''repaired'' physician.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), the Deputy Administrator may deny an application for a DEA Certificate of Registration if he determines that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, the following factors are considered:

(1) The recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board or professional disciplinary authority.

(2) The applicant's experience in dispensing, or conducting research with respect to controlled substances.

(3) The applicant's conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of controlled substances.

(4) Compliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances.

(5) Such other conduct which may threaten the public health and safety.

These factors are to be considered in the disjunctive; the Deputy Administrator may rely on any one or a combination of factors and may give each factor the weight he deems appropriate in determining whether a registration should be revoked or an application for registration be denied. See *Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D.*, Docket No. 88–42, 54 FR 16,422 (1989).

Regarding factor one, it is undisputed that Respondent's application for a license to practice medicine in Alaska was denied in 1984, and his medical license in Pennsylvania was suspended in 1988. It is also undisputed that while Respondent's license to practice medicine in the State of Washington was revoked in 1988, and then reinstated subject to restrictions in 1991, Respondent has possessed an unrestricted medical license in that state since 1994.

Factors two and four, Respondent's experience in dispensing controlled substances and his compliance with applicable laws relating to controlled substances, are relevant in this proceeding. Respondent became addicted to drugs in the early 1980's. Respondent repeatedly violated both state and Federal laws by fraudulently obtaining controlled substances for his own use. In the early 1980's, he prescribed controlled substances using his previous DEA registration to acquire the drugs. While Respondent did receive extensive treatment in 1984 for his admitted chemical dependency, he suffered a relapse in 1987, abusing various drugs including heroin. In late 1987, Respondent unlawfully acquired methadone from a narcotic treatment program where he was working. Therefore, as Judge Randall concluded, ''the Government has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that in the 1980's, the Respondent unlawfully acquired, prescribed, and possessed controlled substances, as well as unlawfully consumed them.'' The Acting Deputy Administrator notes that there is no evidence in the record that Respondent ever unlawfully prescribed and/or dispensed controlled substances for anyone other than himself.

As to factor three, it is undisputed that Respondent has been convicted on several occasions of controlled substances related offenses. In August 1983, he pled nolo contendere in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to three misdemeanor counts of illegal possession of a controlled substance, and to three felony counts of prescribing controlled substances outside the course of medical practice. In July 1984, Respondent was convicted in the United States Court for the District of Alaska of five felony counts of obtaining a controlled substance by fraud, and in August 1984, Respondent was convicted in an Alaska state court of four felony counts relating to the unlawful handling of controlled substances and one misdemeanor count relating to the falsification of an application for a license to practice medicine in Alaska. Further, in August 1988, Respondent was convicted in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington of one count of the unlawful acquisition of a controlled substance. As a result of these convictions, Respondent was incarcerated for a period of time.

Finally, regarding factor five, Respondent has admitted to a long history of substance abuse in the 1980's. He abused his privilege as a DEA registrant to obtain the drugs, he stole methadone from his employer, and he abused heroin. Clearly, this conduct posed a threat to the public safety.

The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that based upon the foregoing, the Government has established a prima facie case for the denial of Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration. However, all of Respondent's unlawful conduct and his convictions stemmed from his drug addiction. Respondent testified that he has been drug-free since March 1988, and there is no evidence in the record of the contrary. In fact, the evidence presented by Respondent shows a strong commitment to continued recovery. Respondent continues to voluntarily participate in the WPHP, and the Director of the program testified that after over nine years of being drug-free, it is unlikely that Respondent will suffer a relapse of his drug abuse. Like Judge Randall, the Acting Deputy Administrator also finds it noteworthy that Respondent's business enterprises are centered around the detection and preventing of drug abuse in the workplace. Finally, the Acting Deputy Administrator finds significant the witness testimony and affidavits, offered on behalf of Respondent, attesting to his personal and professional integrity, and to his continued commitment to sobriety.

The Administrative Law Judge recommended granting Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration, but also found persuasive the Government's argument that ''these multiple offenses are significant [enough] to warrant an extremely close look at any future registration for Respondent.'' Therefore, Judge Randall recommended that the following conditions and restrictions be placed upon Respondent's registration:

''1. That the Respondent maintain a log of all controlled substance prescriptions he issues. At a minimum, the log should indicate the date that the prescription was written, the name of the patient for whom it was written, and the name and dosage of the controlled substance(s) prescribed. The Respondent should maintain this log for a period of three years from the effective date of the final order. Upon request by the Special Agent in Charge of the DEA Field office in Seattle, or his designee, the Respondent shall submit or otherwise make reasonably available his prescription log for inspection.

2. For three years after the effective date of the final order, the Respondent should continue his association with the WPHP, and, if for any reason the WPHP

no longer requires random urine screens, the Respondent shall continue these monthly screens at his own expense. The Respondent shall provide copies of the reports of the results of the screens upon reasonable request by DEA personnel.

3. For three years after the effective date of the final order, regardless of the applicable Washington state law, the Respondent may not prescribe or dispense controlled substances to himself or to any members of his family. The only exception to this limitation is that the Respondent may possess and consume controlled substances which are medically necessary for his own use, and which he has obtained lawfully from another duly authorized physician.''

The Acting Deputy Administrator agrees with the Administrative Law Judge that Respondent should be issued a DEA Certificate of Registration, but that some restrictions on his registration are warranted in light of his past substance abuse, and his use of his previous DEA registration to fraudulently obtain controlled substances.

In his exceptions to Judge Randall's recommended ruling, Respondent contends that the proposed language of the second condition to be imposed on Respondent's registration, if granted, is ambiguous, since it requires that Respondent ''continue these monthly screens'' and he is not currently undergoing ''monthly'' urine screens. Respondent argues that he is currently participating in Phase III of the WPHP, which provides for random toxicology testing, but does not provide for monthly testing. Consequently, Respondent purposes that the restriction be rewritten to require that he continue his participation in Phase III of the WPHP, which includes random urine screens, for three years after the effective date of the final order. The Acting Deputy Administrator agrees with Respondent since the record does not indicate that Respondent is currently required to undergo monthly urine screens.

Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent should be granted a DEA Certificate of Registration subject to the conditions as recommended by Judge Randall with slight modifications. Respondent's registration shall be subject to the following conditions for three years from the date of issuance of the registration:

(1) Respondent shall maintain a log of all controlled substances that he prescribes. At a minimum, the log shall include the name of the patient, the date that the controlled substance was prescribed, and the name, dosage and quantity of the controlled substance prescribed. Upon request by the Special Agent in Charge of the Seattle DEA office, or his designee, Respondent shall submit or otherwise make available this prescription log for inspection.

(2) Respondent shall continue his participation in Phase III of the Washington Physicians Health Program, including such random urine screens, meetings, and other requirements as mandated by the program. Respondent shall immediately notify the Special Agent in Charge of the Seattle DEA office, or his designee, of any urine screens found to be positive for the presence of controlled substances.

(3) Respondent shall not prescribe or dispense any controlled substances to himself or to any members of his family, and shall only administer to himself those controlled substances legitimately dispensed or prescribed to him by another duly authorized practitioner.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and 28 C.F.R. 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application for a DEA Certificate of Registration submitted by Ronald D. Springel, M.D., be, and it hereby is granted, subject to the above described restrictions. This order is effective January 22, 1998.

Dated: December 15, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–33363 Filed 12–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a pre-clearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed revision of the ''International Price Program—U.S. Import Price Indexes.''

A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the addressee section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addressee section below on or before February 23, 1998.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- 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 submissions of responses.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Karin G. Kurz, BLS Clearance Officer, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Room 3255, 2 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20212. Ms. Kurz can be reached on 202–606–7268 (this is not a toll free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The U.S. Import Price Indexes, produced continuously by the Bureau of Labor Statistics' International Price Program (IPP) since 1971, measure price change over time for all categories of imported products, as well as many services. The Office of Management and Budget has listed the Import Price Indexes as a major economic indicator since 1982.

The indexes are widely used in both the public and private sectors. The primary public sector use is deflation of the U.S. Trade statistics and the Gross Domestic Product; the indexes also are used in formulating U.S. trade policy