

information are requested. Comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(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. Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the COPS Office, PPSE Division, 1100 Vermont Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001.

Comments also may be submitted to the COPS Office via facsimile to 202-633-1386. In addition, comments may be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20530. Comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to 202-514-1534.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* New Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Problem Solving Partnerships: Analysis and Assessment Surveys.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form: COPS 29/01. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Local law enforcement agencies that received grant funding for the Problem Solving Partnerships (PSP) grant from the COPS Office will be surveyed regarding the activities and outcomes of the analysis and assessment phases of their grant project.

The agencies implementing the problem-solving process through their PSP grants vary significantly in terms of

population size, primary problems, location, partners, evaluators, and demographics. The agencies and their partners are working together to target either specific property crimes, violent together to target either specific property crimes, violent crimes, problems associated with drugs and/or alcohol, or crimes related to public disorder.

The COPS Office is looking to provide documentation that may stimulate the promotion of problem solving as a way of addressing crime/disorder problems for both current and future grantees looking to implement the problem-solving approach. Copies of the survey instruments to be used by the contractor to obtain information from the PSP grantees are attached. The Analysis Survey will be distributed to grantees once OMB approval is obtained. The Assessment Survey will be distributed to grantees at a later date, once agencies have completed evaluating the impact of their tailor-made responses. Information obtained from these surveys will be disseminated to other departments to promote the adoption of problem-solving approaches.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* Each survey, the Analysis Survey and the Assessment Survey, will be administered one time: Approximately 470 respondents per survey administration, at 55 minutes per respondent per survey (including record-keeping).

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* Approximately 861.6 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: September 22, 1998.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 98-25801 Filed 9-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AT-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Division; Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of Information Collection Under Review; (Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved

collection for which approval has expired) Claims Under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

The Department of Justice, Civil Division, has submitted the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Office of Management and Budget approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 1998, allowing for a 60-day public comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comment until October 28, 1998. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 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 Information and 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 Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Deputy Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington DC 20530.

Written comments and/or suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

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

(2) 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;

(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.

Overview of this information:

(1) *Type of information collection:* Extension of a previously approved collection.

(2) *The title of the form/collection:* Claims Under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* none. Civil Division, United States Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households; Other: none.

Information is collected to determine whether an individual is entitled to compensation under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, 42 U.S.C. 2210 note (1994). Applicants include individuals who resided near the Nevada Test Site; former underground uranium miners; and, individuals who participated onsite in an atmospheric nuclear test.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* 914 annual respondents at 2.5 hours per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 2,285 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mrs. Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: September 22, 1998.

Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 98-25798 Filed 9-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-12-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-54]

Paul J. Caragine, Jr., Grant of Restricted Registration

On July 10, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Paul Caragine, M.D., (Respondent) of Denville, New Jersey, 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), as being inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated September 6, 1995, Respondent, through counsel, filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Newark, New Jersey on June 25, 26 and 27 and November 19, 20 and 21, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, counsel for both parties submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On March 31, 1998, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision, recommending that Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration be denied. On April 17, 1998, Respondent filed exceptions and objections to Judge Bittner's opinion and on May 4, 1998, the Government filed its response to Respondent's exceptions. Thereafter, May 8, 1998, Judge Bittner 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, the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, except as specifically noted below, but does not adopt the Administrative Law Judge's recommended ruling. 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 received his medical degree in 1971 from what is now the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and first become licensed to practice medicine in New Jersey in 1973. He has practiced orthopedic medicine in various locations throughout the State of New Jersey. According to Respondent he has treated approximately 15,000 patients over a 20-year period.

In 1988, a New Jersey state agency initiated an investigation of Respondent based upon information from a pharmacist about prescriptions Respondent had issued to two individuals. Thereafter, a state investigator collected and reviewed controlled substance prescriptions issued by Respondent to 11 patients.

Based upon the investigator's review, the New Jersey Medical Board (Medical

Board) held an informal hearing on November 27, 1991, regarding Respondent's prescribing practices. Respondent testified at that hearing that he believed in using pain killing drugs for patients who needed them to function. However, Respondent also stated that, "I'm a lot stricter and tougher about this than I was. I mean, as I look back I realize that I was really too lenient with all these people. * * * I must appear to be a fool and I'm setting myself up here by going along with all these people, going along with all these stories. * * * No more. In the last three years I've had a really exemplary record. I'm very careful. I'm not so easy to get drugs out of like I use[d] to be." Respondent emphasized that only two of the patients at issue were still under his care and that he had told them that he would stop prescribing controlled substances to them on April 1, 1992. Respondent further asserted that "there are no new people out there who represent future problems for this board or for me," and that "I want the board to know that I really made an effort to clean up my act and not be permissive. My only past sin was being too gullible and too charitable." When asked what had prompted the change, Respondent stated that, "It just occurred to me after a period of time that this couldn't be right."

During this same time period, a local police department received information in August 1991 that two individuals were suspected of distributing narcotics. A subsequent survey of area pharmacies revealed that Respondent had issued most of the controlled substance prescriptions for these individuals. A review of the prescriptions showed, among other things, that one of the individuals obtained 480 dosage units of Vicodin, a Schedule III controlled substance, between August 22 and September 23, 1992, pursuant to prescriptions and refills authorized by Respondent. On October 2, 1992, a search warrant was executed at the individuals' apartment, during which investigators discovered marijuana, marijuana paraphernalia, 88 prescription vials (86 of which were empty), a prescription for Percocet written by Respondent and postdated October 7, 1992, and notes indicating drug distributions. Approximately 85-90% of the prescription vials indicated that they were authorized by Respondent.

The individuals were interviewed following their arrest for among other things, possession of marijuana and drug paraphernalia. One of the individuals admitted that she had filled