Management (610), Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, 18th and C Streets NW., Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John W. Bebout, Chief, Branch of Reservoir Management, Bureau of Land Management, (202) 653–2263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 17(b) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 226(b)) required the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases competitively if the lands to be leased were within the boundary of a "known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field" (KGS). Section 32 of the 1920 Act (30 U.S.C. 189) authorized the Secretary to "fix and determine the boundary lines" of KGSs.

In 1984, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit ruled unlawful (1) the delineation of a KGS based on a spacing unit or other linear step-out without considering all available geologic information, and (2) the limitation of a KGS to a known trap or pool, that is, to a drainage area (Arkla Exploration Company v. Texas Oil and Gas Corporation, 734 F.2d 347). Following this ruling, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) clarified the standards and procedures under which KGSs were to be delineated.

With the passage of the "Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987," an all-competitive leasing system was established. While this relieves the BLM of the need for future KGS delineation, the law specifically requires that "* * * all noncompetitive oil and gas lease applications and offers and competitive oil and gas bids pending on the date of enactment of this subtitle shall be processed, and leases shall be issued under the provisions of the Act of February 25, 1920, as in effect before its amendment by this subtitle * * *." As a result of this "grandfather" provision, the Bureau will continue its KGS process for all offers, applications and bids pending at the time of enactment of the Leasing Reform Act.

As part of its on-going quality assurance efforts, the BLM has completed an internal review of 32 KGS classifications. An audit team composed of six KGS technical experts conducted the review which is summarized in a report entitled "Audit Report on 32 KGS Classifications." The report discusses, in part, 92 appeals pending as of August 6, 1987, with the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) which involve these KGSs. Based on the review, BLM has requested the IBLA to remand 3 appeals for further consideration.

The public is requested to provide general comments on the BLM's KGS policies in effect prior to December 22, 1987, and specific comments on its quality assurance efforts (including the audit report). It should be noted that neither the report, nor any public comments received in response to this public request, are intended to provide a basis on which to decide appeals associated with the 32 KGSs reviewed. Commentors are, therefore, requested not to restate arguments made to the IBLA.

Date: February 11, 1988.

Robert F. Burford,

Director.

[FR Doc. 88–3784 Filed 2–22–88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-M

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before February 13, 1988. Pursuant to § 60.13 of 36 CFR Part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the National Register, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC 20243. Written comments should be submitted by March 9, 1988.

Carol D. Shull,

Chief of Registration, National Register.

ALASKA

Barrow County

Etivluk Lake Archeological District
Kinyiksukvik Lake Archeological District
Tukuto Lake Archeological District
Upper Colville Multiple Resource Archeological District

ARIZONA

Maricopa County

Phoenix, *Story, F.Q., Neighborhood Historic District,* McDowell Rd., Seventh Ave., Roosevelt St. and Sixteenth Ave.

FLORIDA

Palm Beach County

Delray Beach, *Delray Beach Schools,* Blk. 68

KANSAS

Doniphan County

Troy vicinity, *Eclipse School,* Off US 36 NE of Troy

Douglas County

Lawrence, *Priestly House,* 1505 Kentucky St.

MARYLAND

Baltimore County

Owings Mills *Meadows, The,* 302 Meadows Ln.

MASSACHUSETTS

Berkshire County

Stockbridge, *Shadow Brook Farm Historic District,* Lenox West Rd./MA 183 near Bucks Ln.

Suffolk County

Boston, *Dedham Manufacturing Company Historic District,* Knight and Readville Sts. and Damon Pl.

Worcester County

Ayer, *Ayer Main Street Historic District,* Main St. roughly between Park and Columbia Sts.

MINNESOTA

Beltrami County

Bemidji, *Paul Bunyan and Babe the Blue Ox,* Third St. and Bemidji Ave.

Hubbard County

Park Rapids vicinity, *Hubbard Lodge No. 130,* Off CH 6

NEW YORK

Otsego County

Richfield Springs, *Sunnyside,* 72 E. Main St.

OHIO

Cuyahoga County

Gates Mills, *Kulas, E.J., Estate Historic District,* West Hill Dr.

Fayette County

Washington Court House, *Rawlings-Brownell House,* 318 Rawlings St.

Franklin County

Columbus, *Schlee Brewery Historic District,* 526, 543, 560 and rear 526 S. Front St. and NE corner of Beck St. and Wall Alley

Lake County

Mentor, *Moore, Edward W. and Louise C., Estate,* 7960 Garfield Rd.

Montgomery County

Dayton, *Westbrock Funeral Home,* 1712 Wayne Ave.

TENNESSEE

Lawrence County

Fall River vicinity, *Mount Zion Methodist Episcopal Church South,* Mount Zion Rd.

[FR Doc. 88–3790 Filed 2–22–88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 86-69]

David E. Trawick, D.D.S.; Revocation of Registration

On August 11, 1986, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to David E. Trawick, D.D.S., Respondent, of 417 West Warren Street, Shelby, North Carolina, seeking to revoke DEA Certificate of Registration AD2115877, and to deny his pending application for renewal of that registration, executed on May 4, 1986. The statutory basis for seeking the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration was that his continued registration was inconsistent with the public interest, based upon his indictment and conviction of possession of cocaine; and his personal abuse, and distribution of cocaine for other than legitimate medical purposes, outside the scope of his professional practice.

Subsequent to his receipt of the Order to show Cause, Respondent, through counsel, requested a hearing on the issues raised in that order. The matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Francis L. Young, and an administrative hearing was held on February 27, 1987, in Washington, DC.

On September 29, 1987, the Administrative Law Judge issued his opinion and recommended ruling, in which he recommended that the Administrator revoke Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration and deny his pending application for renewal of that registration. On November 22, 1987, counsel for Respondent filed exceptions to the opinion and recommended ruling of the Administrative Law Judge.

After careful consideration of the entire record in this matter, the Administrator adopts the findings of fact and conclusions of law recommended by the Administrative Law Judge.

The Administrator finds that on October 17, 1985, in the North Carolina General Court of Justice for Cleveland County, Respondent was convicted, after entering a plea of guilty, to one count of possession of cocaine, a misdemeanor violation relating to controlled substances. As a result of that conviction, Respondent was placed on supervised probation for a period of three years, and was fined $2,000.00.

Respondent's arrest and conviction resulted from a drug investigation initiated by the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office in North Carolina. In 1982 and 1984, the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office received reliable information from an individual that Respondent was using cocaine and other illicit drugs, and also was allowing other persons to use illicit drugs at his residence. In addition, in 1984, another reliable cooperating individual informed the sheriff's office that Respondent was purchasing, using, and selling cocaine. Based upon the reliable information received from these two individuals, the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office initiated an undercover investigation into Respondent's alleged controlled substance violations. A Special Agent from the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation was brought into the case in an undercover capacity, posing as an art dealer.

The Special Agent and the cooperating individual initially met with Respondent as his residence in September 1984. During that visit, the cooperating individual directed the Special Agent to a breakfront in Respondent's residence which contained a bag of marijuana. At no time during that visit was the use of or purchase of controlled substances discussed. Later that month, Respondent, the Special Agent and the cooperating individual dined together at a local restaurant. Again, the use or purchase of controlled substances was not discussed that evening.

The Special Agent and the cooperating individual returned to Respondent's residence in October 1984. During the visit, the cooperating individual retrieved a bag of marijuana from the breakfront. At that time, Respondent informed the Special Agent that the marijuana was of good quality, and that he always kept marijuana at his residence, although he preferred the high achieved with other drugs such as cocaine, as compared to the high from marijuana. During that meeting, the Special Agent asked Respondent whether he could obtain any cocaine. Respondent made a few phone calls in an attempt to acquire some cocaine for the Special Agent, but was unable to reach anyone.

On the evening of November 21, 1984, the Special Agent and the cooperating individual returned to Respondent's residence. During that visit, the Special Agent again inquired as to whether Respondent could locate some cocaine for him. Respondent placed a telephone call and was able to procure one-eighth of an ounce of cocaine from a third party. The Special Agent and Respondent agreed to split the cocaine. Shortly thereafter, three other individuals arrived at Respondent's residence and delivered a bag containing a white powder purporting to be cocaine. After examining the bag of powder, Respondent handed it to the Special Agent who also examined it, divided the contents, and returned one-half of the powder and $150.00 to Respondent. After the powder was divided, Respondent proceeded to ingest a substantial portion of his share of the drug. During that same evening, the Special Agent noticed a tray of marijuana displayed on Respondent's living room table. The Special Agent and the cooperating individual departed the cooperating individual departed Respondent's residence shortly after Respondent ingested his share of the powder. After leaving Respondent's residence, the Special Agent had his share of the powder analyzed. It was later found to be 1.5 grams of cocaine.

Subsequent to that visit, the Special Agent learned that Respondent had come to suspect his true identity. In December 1984, the Special Agent and the cooperating individual returned to Respondent's residence for the purpose of determining whether, in fact, Respondent had discovered that the Special Agent was a police officer. During that visit, Respondent claimed that he did not know anything about cocaine, and did not want the Special Agent or the cooperating individual calling him again.

In his testimony, Respondent never claimed that he possessed marijuana or cocaine at his residence for any legitimate medical purpose. However, although he admitted to abusing alcohol, he refused to admit his addiction to cocaine. Instead, he claimed he used it only on rare occasions. Respondent also denied his involvement in any illegal drug transactions. Rather, he attempted to claim that he was coerced by the Special Agent. The Administrator finds that, based upon Respondent's testimony, he has yet to fully recognize and admit the extent of his drug abuse and the unlawful activities related to his abuse of controlled substances.

Only Respondent testified as to his rehabilitation since his arrest. The record shows that Respondent entered a one month alcohol and drug rehabilitation program in March 1985. In addition, a former drug abuser submitted an affidavit in which he claimed that Respondent attended meetings at Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous two to three times a week. Respondent testified that he has been required to undergo urinalysis testing on only two occasions since December 1985. Respondent did not submit any affidavits or testimony from persons directly involved in his rehabilitative care.

Respondent also submitted testimony and affidavits from several individuals who attested to his dental skills, but did not address his drug and alcohol abuse problems nor his efforts at rehabilitation. In fact, it was quite clear that even persons who were close to Respondent were totally unaware of his drug abuse problem.

The Administrator finds that there is no evidence in the administrative record that Respondent ever abused his controlled substance prescribing privileges in an effort to unlawfully obtain controlled substances. In addition, there is no allegation that Respondent improperly handled controlled substances within his professional practice. In fact, the testimony presented at the hearing indicated that Respondent is a highly respected dentist in the community, and that even associates who worked with him were unaware of his alcohol and drug abuse problems.

Although Respondent's unlawful activities relating to controlled substances occurred outside of his professional practice, the Administrator finds that such activities are of a sufficient magnitude to warrant the revocation of his DEA Certificate of Registration. Under 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4), the Administrator can revoke a registration based upon a sufficient showing that the continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. The factors which are considered in determining whether the continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest are:

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

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

(3) The applicant's or registrant'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; and

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

There is no requirement that the Administrator must make findings with respect to all five factors listed above. Instead, the Administrator has the discretion to give each factor the weight he deems appropriate, depending upon the facts and circumstances presented in each case, in determining the public interest. See *England Pharmacy*, 52 FR 1674 (1987); *Paul Stepak, M.D.*, 51 FR 17556 (1986); *Felix Seisen, M.D.*, Docket No. 85–53, 51 FR 3863 (1986); and *Anne L. Hendricks, M.D.*, Docket No. 86–4, 51 FR 41030.

In addition, offenses or wrongful acts committed by a registrant outside of his professional practice, but which relate to controlled substances may constitute sufficient grounds for the revocation of a registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration. See *Jose Antonio Pla-Cisneros, M.D.*, 52 FR 42154 (1987); *Walker L. Whaley, M.D.*, Docket No. 85–12, 51 FR 15556 (1986); and *Paul Stepak, M.D.*, supra.

Therefore, all wrongful acts relating to controlled substances committed by a registrant can be taken into consideration by the Administrator when deciding whether to allow that registrant to retain the privileges granted him by a DEA Certificate of Registration.

In this case, Respondent has been convicted of misdemeanor possession of cocaine, was found to have cocaine and marijuana in his residence, and has a history of abusing alcohol and controlled substances. Although the record indicates that Respondent has undertaken some rehabilitation efforts with respect to his drug and alcohol abuse problems, little substantive information regarding his success was presented at the administrative hearing. In addition, since Respondent has not fully admitted to his criminal involvement and drug abuse problems, the Administrator has grave reservations about his rehabilitation.

A medical professional, because of his training and experience, must be aware of the awful devastation and health consequences associated with drug abuse. By possessing, abusing and aiding in the distribution of controlled substances, Respondent has abandoned the trust placed in him as a physician as well as his responsibility as a registrant, to safeguard the public from the unlawful use and abuse of controlled substances. Therefore, the Administrator concludes that Respondent's registration is no longer consistent with the public interest.

In light of the foregoing facts, Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration must be revoked. Accordingly, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and 21 CFR 0.100(b), orders that DEA Certificate of Registration AD2115877, previously issued to David E. Trawick, D.D.S., be, and it hereby is, revoked; the Administrator further orders that any pending applications for renewal of Respondent's registration be, and they hereby are, denied.

This order is effective March 24, 1988.

Dated: Bebruary 16, 1988.

John C. Lawn,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 88-3732 Filed 2-22-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Agency Recordkeeping/Reporting Requirements Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget

Background: The Department of Labor, in carrying out its responsibilities under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), considers comments on the reporting and recordkeeping requirements that will affect the public.

List of Recordkeeping/Reporting Requirements Under Review: As necessary, the Department of Labor will publish a list of the Agency recordkeeping/reporting requirements under review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) since the last list was published. The list will have all entries grouped into new collections, revisions, extensions, or reinstatements. The Departmental Clearance Officer will, upon request, be able to advise members of the public of the nature of the particular submission they are interested in. Each entry may contain the following information:

The Agency of the Department issuing this recordkeeping/reporting requirement.

The title of the recordkeeping/reporting requirement.

The OMB and Agency identification numbers, if applicable.

How often the recordkeeping/reporting requirement is needed.

Who will be required to or asked to report or keep records.

Whether small businesses or organizations are affected.

An estimate of the total number of hours needed to comply with recordkeeping/reporting requirements.

The number of forms in the request for approval, if applicable.

An abstract describing the need for and uses of the information collection.

Comments and Questions: Copies of the recordkeeping/reporting requirements may be obtained by calling the Departmental Clearance Officer, Paul E. Larson, telephone (202) 523–6331. Comments and questions about the items on this list should be directed to Mr. Larson, Office of Information

Management, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N-1301, Washington, DC 20210. Comments should also be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for (BLS/DM/ESA/ETA/OLMS/MSHA/OSHA/PWBA/VETS), Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, Washington, DC 20503 (Telephone (202) 395-6880).

Any member of the public who wants to comment on a recordkeeping/reporting requirement which has been submitted to OMB should advise Mr. Larson of this intent at the earliest possible date.

New

Employment and Training Administration
Feasibility Study on Implementing a Substate Area Unemployment Insurance Benefit Program
One-time
State or local governments
53 respondents; 106 burden hours; no forms

This study will collect information on the administrative feasibility and effectiveness of benefit targeting of a substate unemployment insurance (UI) program as a basis for future policy and administrative decisions. Information will be collected from state UI agencies by means of telephone interviews.

Revision

Employment Standards Administration
Accident Data on School Bus Drivers Report 1215-0045; WH-374
Monthly
State or local governments
2,270 responses; 1,135 hours; 1 form

Section 570.52 declares the occupation of motor vehicle driver to be hazardous for 16 and 17 year olds. Upon application by a State, an exemption may be granted to permit such minors to drive school buses. The data provided on form WH-374 is used to evaluate whether an exemption is warranted.

Extension

Employment and Training Administration
Annual Plans for State Employment Service Activities
1205-0209; no forms
Annually
State or local government
54 respondents; 4,860 burden hours; no forms.

Regulations under 20 CFR Part 652 implement Pub. L. 97-300 amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act. Information collection requirements pertain to those sections of the Act which require States to submit plans concerning operations and expenditures prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Signed at Washington, DC this 16th day of February, 1988.

Paul E. Larson,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 88-3809 Filed 2-22-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-23-M

Employment and Training Administration

A. O. Smith Water Products Co., et al; Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than March 4, 1988.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than March 3, 1988.

The petitions filed in this case are available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20213.

Signed at Washington, DC this 16th day of February 1988.

Glenn M. Zech,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

APPENDIX

Petitioner (union/workers/firm)	Location	Date received	Date of petition	Petition No.	Articles produced
A.O. Smith Water Products Co. (IAMAW)	Kankakee, IL	2/16/88	1/19/88	20,458	Water heaters.
Chrysler Corp. (IAMAW)	Kenosha, WI	2/16/88	1/2/88	20,459	Automobiles.
Gregory & Cook, Inc. (Workers)	Houston, TX	2/16/88	2/3/88	20,460	Pipeline installation.
Goldston Corp. (Workers)	Corpus Christi, TX	2/16/88	2/1/88	20,461	Machinery.
Gulf Interstate Engineering Co. (Company)	Houston, TX	2/16/88	1/25/88	20,462	Crude oil.
Herman I. Zacharia & Son (Workers)	New York, NY	2/16/88	1/29/88	20,463	Night wear.
Litton Microwave Cooking Products (UEW)	Sioux Falls, SD	2/16/88	2/2/88	20,464	Microwave ovens.
Maine Guide (Workers)	Bath, ME	2/16/88	1/29/88	20,465	Coats.
PPG Industries, Inc. (Workers)	Tipton, PA	2/16/88	2/5/88	20,466	Automotive lights.
Portage Mills (TWU)	Portage, WI	2/16/88	2/3/88	20,467	Slippers.
Wolverine Knitting Mills (ILGWU)	Bay City, MI	2/16/88	2/4/88	20,468	Night wear.

[FR Doc. 88-3812 Filed 2-22-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

Preway Inc., et al.; Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance issued during the period February 1, 1988-February 5, 1988 and February 8, 1988-February 12, 1988.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a