

comments received will be provided to the AMWG and TWG members at their respective meetings.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Randall Peterson, telephone (801) 524-3758; faxogram (801) 524-3858; or via e-mail at rpeterson@uc.usbr.gov.

Dated: October 2, 2002.

Randall V. Peterson,
Manager, Adaptive Management and Environmental Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 02-26067 Filed 10-11-02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-02-030]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.
TIME AND DATE: October 18, 2002 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. No. TA-421-1 (Market Disruption)(Pedestal Actuators from China)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination on market disruption to the President on October 18, 2002.).
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission:

Issued: October 10, 2002.

Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 02-26331 Filed 10-10-02; 2:36 pm]
BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-02-031]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.
TIME AND DATE: October 21, 2002 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none
2. Minutes
3. Ratification List
4. Inv. Nos. 731-TA-1014-1018 (Preliminary) (Polyvinyl Alcohol from China, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Singapore)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination to the Secretary of Commerce on October 21, 2002; Commissioners' opinions are currently scheduled to be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce on or before October 28, 2002.)
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission:

Issued: October 10, 2002.

Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 02-26332 Filed 10-10-02; 2:36 pm]
BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-02-032]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: October 22, 2002 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. Nos. 701-TA-426 and 731-TA-984-985 (Final) (Sulfanilic Acid from Hungary and Portugal)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before November 1, 2002.)
5. Inv. No. 731-TA-749 (Review) (Persulfates from China)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before October 31, 2002.)
6. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting,

may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

Issued: October 10, 2002.

By order of the Commission:

Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 02-26355 Filed 10-10-02; 3:30 pm]
BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Douglas L. Geiger, M.D.; Denial of Application

On September 24, 2001, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Douglas L. Geiger, M.D. (Dr. Geiger), proposing to deny his pending application for DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, and deny any pending modifications of such application pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f). As a basis for the denial of his pending application, the Order to Show Cause alleged that Dr. Geiger is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of Georgia. 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3). The order also notified Dr. Geiger that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, his hearing right would be deemed waived.

The Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to Dr. Geiger at a location in Riverdale, Georgia. A second copy of the Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to Dr. Geiger at a location in College Park, Georgia. DEA received a signed receipt indicating that the Order to Show Cause was received on behalf of Dr. Geiger at that location. Subsequently, and at Dr. Geiger's request, a copy of the Order to Show Cause was sent to him by facsimile on October 9, 2001. DEA received a printed report indicating that the show cause order had been successfully transmitted to the number provided by Dr. Geiger. DEA has not received a request for hearing or any other reply from Dr. Geiger or anyone purporting to represent him in this matter.

Therefore, the Deputy Administrator, finding that (1) 30 days have passed since the receipt of the Order to Show Cause, and (2) no request for a hearing having been received, concludes that Dr. Geiger is deemed to have waived his hearing right. After considering material from the investigative file in this matter, the Deputy Administrator now enters his final order without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(d) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Deputy Administrator finds that Dr. Geiger was issued a temporary medical license #0142 on October 6, 1994. That license was extended until December 8, 1994, and subsequently extended on separate occasions until its expiration on October 5, 1995. A second temporary medical license was issued to Dr. Geiger on December 21, 1998, and on February 4, 1999, that license also expired. According to a August 6, 2001 letter contained within the investigative file from the Executive Director of the Composite State Board of Medical Examiners, Dr. Geiger has never been issued a permanent license to practice medicine in the State of Georgia.

DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts business. *See* 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. *See* Carla Johnson, M.D., 66 FR 52939 (2001); Graham Travers Schuler, M.D., 65 FR 50570 (2000); Demetris A. Green, M.D., 61 FR 60,728 (1996).

DEA has also consistently held that a DEA registration may not be maintained if the applicant or registrant lacks state authority to dispense controlled substances, even if such lack of state authorization was the result of the expiration of his/her state registration without further action by the state. *See e.g.*, Mark L. Beck, D.D.S., 64 FR 40899 (1999); Gary D. Benke, M.D., 58 FR 65734 (1993); Carlyle Balgobin, D.D.S., 58 FR 46992 (1993); Charles H. Ryan, M.D., 58 FR 14430 (1993); James H. Nickens, M.D., 57 FR 59847 (1992).

In the instant case, the Deputy Administrator finds that there is evidence demonstrating that Dr. Geiger is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Georgia, the State in which he seeks a DEA registration. Since Dr. Geiger lacks such authority, he is not entitled to a DEA registration in that state.

Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application for DEA Certificate of Registration submitted by Douglas L. Geiger, M.D. be, and it hereby is denied. This order is effective November 14, 2002.

Dated: September 30, 2002.

John B. Brown III,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 02-26164 Filed 10-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Development of a National Reporting System To Collect Performance and "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded Grantees to Eligible Clients

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Request for Information on the Development of a National Reporting System to Collect Performance and "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded Grantees to Eligible Clients.

SUMMARY: This notice is a request for information for use by the Legal Services Corporation regarding the Development of a National Reporting System to Collect "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded grantees to Eligible Clients.

ADDRESSES: Two (2) copies of written submissions should be addressed to Wendy Burnette, Legal Services Corporation, 750 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20002-4250.

DATES: Information must be submitted by 5 p.m., January 17, 2003. This is an extension of submission date of September 28, 2002 included in a previously published notice for this RFI.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randi Youells or Michael Genz, Legal Services Corporation, 750 1st Street NE., Washington, DC 20002-4250.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is a private, nonprofit corporation established by the Congress of the United States to ensure equal access to justice under the law by providing legal assistance in civil matter to low-income individuals. LSC is headed by an 11-member board of directors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

LSC does not itself provide legal services to low-income Americans. The Corporation is authorized by Congress to make grants and contracts to support the provision of civil legal assistance to clients who meet eligibility requirements. LSC develops and administers policy consistent with Congressional mandate, secures and receives federal appropriations and allocates these appropriations to not-for-profit legal services organizations throughout the country; assures that grantees of LSC funds comply with federal law and regulations; and guarantees the delivery of high quality services to eligible low-income people in the United States and its territories. LSC makes grants to organizations that

provide legal assistance to indigent persons throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and Micronesia. LSC grants federal dollars to independent local programs chosen through a system of competition.

As a delivery system, legal services programs provide a full range of services to eligible clients. While grantees provide many kinds of services to clients, all are reported to LSC as either cases (the CSR reporting system) or matters (the MSR reporting system). However, neither CSR nor MSR statistics give any information on the outcome of a particular case. In fact, the CSR system reveals very little about a case closed by and LSC-funded grantee other than the following:

- That the grantee accepted the case, that is, the case met the eligibility guidelines established by the program's board and by LSC;
- That the case was "completed" or closed within the calendar year covered by the CSR submission;
- The manner in which the case was handled, such as 'advice'; and
- The general area of law in which the case falls (e.g., housing law, family law).

This is perceived as problematic for several reasons:

(1) By simply counting closed cases the CSR system reduces the provision of legal services to a number rather than helping us understand what changes grantees have made in the lives of our clients and their communities.

(2) Reducing to a single number (a "closed case") the services that a grantee provides to a client makes the work of grantees seem easy and undemanding.

(3) Because the CSR data do not measure performance and outcomes, it does not allow LSC and its grantees to objectively track whether we are expanding access and improving performance quality as required by LSC's five-year Strategic Plan.

(4) CSR data do not allow for comparisons of grantees in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of grantees' work for clients. Although we are able to extrapolate "cost-per-case" from the CSR data, the data do not enable us to identify which grantees are working ineffectively or do not otherwise meet the standards commonly expected of high quality legal services providers. Conversely, we cannot objectively identify our strongest programs so that we can understand what makes them "best" in order to replicate them.

(5) The CSR/MSR data do not present information that allows the legal service community to draw reasonable conclusions about what happened to