Control Committee, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (715) 682–6186 or Jay Troxel, Coordinator, Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (703) 358–1718.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. I), this notice announces a meeting of the Ruffe Control Committee, a regional committee of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force established under the authority of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–646, 104 Stat. 4761, 16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq., November 29, 1990).

Dated: September 23, 1994.

Conrad Fjetland,

Acting Assistant Director — Fisheries.

[FR Doc. 94–24427 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposal for the collection of information listed below has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Copies of the proposed collection of information, the related form and explanatory material may be obtained by contacting the Bureau's clearance officer at the phone number listed below. Comments and suggestions on the requirements should be made directly to the Bureau clearance officer listed below and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1029–0041), Washington, DC 20503, telephone 202–395–7340.

Title: Part 773—Requirements for Permits and Permit Processing.

OMB Number: 1029–0041.

Abstract: Ensures that applicants for permanent program permits or their associates, who are in violation of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act do not receive or maintain surface coal mining permits.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency: On occasion.

Description of Respondents: State Regulatory Authorities and Mining Company officials.

Annual Responses: 1,652.

Annual Burden Hours: 7,389.

Estimated Completion Time: 4.5 hours.

Bureau clearance officer: John A. Trelease (202) 343–1475.

Dated: March 3, 1994.

Andrew F. DeVito,

Chief, Branch of Environmental and Economic Analysis.

Note: This document was received by the Office of the Federal Register on September 29, 1994.

[FR Doc. 94–24532 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Finance Docket No. 32533]

Burlington Northern Railroad Company, Inc. and Protexa Burlington International—Joint Application Under 49 U.S.C. 11321

AGENCY: Interstate Commerce Commission.

ACTION: Discontinuance of Proceeding.

SUMMARY: By notice filed September 20, 1994, Burlington Northern Railroad Company, Inc. (BN), on its own behalf and for Protexa Burlington International (PBI), informed the Commission that it wished to withdraw the joint application by BN and PBI, under the Panama Canal Act, 49 U.S.C. 11321. BN's withdrawal request is granted and this proceeding is discontinued.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This notice is effective on September 29, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 927–5660. [TDD for hearing impaired (202) 927–5721]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In their application filed June 13, 1994, applicants sought a determination that BN's ownership and operation of PBI do not violate the provisions of the Panama Canal Act. The application also sought approval of BN's continued ownership of PBI in view of the anticipated expansion of PBI's water carrier operations in Mexico. Notice of the application, served and published September 16, 1994 (59 FR 47641), called for comments to the application by October 17, 1994 and replies by November 7, 1994. BN states that it is withdrawing the application in view of a number of intervening developments, including the proposed merger of Burlington Northern Inc. and Santa Fe Pacific Corporation.

Decided: September 28, 1994.

By the Commission, Vernon A. Williams, Acting Secretary.

Vernon A. Williams,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 94–24494 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Information Collections Under Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been sent the following collection(s) of information proposals for review under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35) and the Paperwork Reduction Reauthorization Act since the last list was published. Entries are grouped into submission categories, with each entry containing the following information:

(1) The title of the form/collection;
(2) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection;
(3) How often the form must be filled out or the information is collected;
(4) Who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract;
(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond;
(6) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection; and,
(7) An indication as to whether Section 3504(h) of Public Law 96–511 applies.

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 OMB reviewer, Mr. Jeff Hill on (202) 395–7340 *and* to the Department of Justice's Clearance Officer, Mr. Robert B. Briggs, on (202) 514–4319. If you anticipate commenting on a form/collection, but find that time to prepare such comments will prevent you from prompt submission, you should notify the OMB reviewer *and* the DOJ Clearance Officer of your intent as soon as possible.

Written comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection may be submitted to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503, *and* to Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Department of Justice Clearance Officer, Systems Policy Staff/Information Resources Management/Justice Management Division, Suite 850, WCTR, Washington, DC 20530.

New Collection

(1) Criminal Alien Assistance Program.
(2) Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
(3) Annually.
(4) State or local governments.

Information regarding numbers, names and status of illegal criminal

aliens and average annual cost of incarceration may be provided by the states for the reimbursement of cost of illegal criminal alien incarceration.
(5) 54 respondents @ 1 hour per response.
(6) 54 annual burden hours.
(7) Not applicable under Section 3504(h).

Public comment on, this item is encouraged.

Dated: September 28, 1994.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 94–24447 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 92–42]

Alra Laboratories, Inc., Denial of Application for Registration

On March 4, 1992, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), directed an Order to Show Cause to Alra Laboratories, Inc. (Respondent), proposing to deny its application for registration as a manufacturer of controlled substances, on grounds that: (1) during an on-site inspection in July 1990 DEA investigators determined that although it was not registered to do so, Respondent continued to distribute and possess controlled substances in violation of 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1) and 843(a)(2), had failed to comply with inventory and recordkeeping requirements regarding these controlled substances, and had improperly stored controlled substances together with non-controlled drugs and other materials; (2) in April 1987 Respondent was cited for failure to file periodic ARCOS reports for 1985, 1986, and the first quarter of 1987; (3) as the result of a November 1987 inspection, Respondent was issued a Letter of Admonition citing its failure to file ARCOS reports as required by 21 U.S.C. 827(d) and 21 CFR 1304.35, an accurate biennial inventory in violation of 21 U.S.C. 827(a) and 21 CFR 1304.11, and its failure to maintain effective controls against the diversion of controlled substances as required by 21 CFR 1301.71; (4) in 1986, 1988, and 1989 Respondent did not timely renew its registration; and (5) Respondent has a history of violating Food and Drug Administration [FDA] requirements pertaining to recordkeeping, documentation and good manufacturing practices.

Respondent, by counsel, filed a request for hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause, and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. Following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Chicago, Illinois, on August 18 and 19, 1992.

On July 30, 1993, in her opinion and recommended ruling, findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision, the administrative law judge recommended that Respondent's application for registration be granted, contingent upon a satisfactory pre-registration investigation and upon Respondent arranging at its own expense for annual independent audits of its controlled substance handling for a period of five years after registration is granted. No exceptions were filed by either party, and on August 30, 1993, the administrative law judge transmitted the record to the Administrator. On October 13, 1993, the DEA Chief Counsel filed a request for remand with the Administrator, and on October 27, 1993, then-Administrator Robert C. Bonner remanded the case to the administrative law judge for further proceedings, noting that an indictment had been filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois alleging that Respondent's owner had violated the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C) with respect to the manufacture and distribution of prescription drugs.

On November 3, 1993, the administrative law judge rescinded her July 30, 1993 decision, reopened the record, and directed the parties to submit statements specifying the additional evidence that they wished to produce. A hearing on remand was scheduled, but canceled after the Government advised that it had no further evidence other than the indictment itself. Respondent submitted additional documents and both parties submitted argument on remand. On May 12, 1994, Judge Bittner issued her supplemental opinion and recommended ruling, findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision, in which she found that the Government had shown probable cause that Respondent's owners had committed the acts alleged, but that the Government had failed to show the criminal conduct alleged by a preponderance of the evidence. Accordingly, Judge Bittner found that there was no basis to modify her previous conclusions set forth in her July 1993 decision, and therefore she reissued that decision. No exceptions were filed by either party. On June 17, 1994, the administrative law judge transmitted the entire reord, including her original and supplemental opinions, to the Deputy Administrator.

The Deputy Administrator has carefully considered the entire record in this matter and, pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order in this matter based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth.

In her supplemental opinion issued on May 12, 1994, the administrative law judge found that there was nothing on the record from the 1992 hearing or upon remand tending to prove or disprove the allegations of the August 13, 1993 indictment or the January 26, 1994 superseding indictment. The Deputy Administrator adopts this finding of the administrative law judge. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator has not considered any of the matters offered on remand and, in this decision, will refer solely to matters on the record from the 1992 hearing.

The administrative law judge found that Respondent is a pharmaceutical manufacturer founded by Baldev Raj Bhutani, Ph.D., in 1982. Respondent was registered as a manufacturer of controlled substances by DEA on July 30, 1982, and renewed this registration in June 1983 and July 1984. Respondent developed a generic form of clorazepate dipotassium, a Schedule IV controlled substance, and received FDA approval to market it in 1988. In 1991, Respondent subsequently received FDA approval to manufacture dosage forms of the Schedule IV controlled substances propoxyphene and meprobamate, and acquired Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDA) for the Schedule IV controlled substance chlordiazepoxide.

The administrative law judge found that in December 1984, DEA investigators conducted a regularly scheduled investigation and determined that Respondent was generally in compliance with DEA recordkeeping requirements, except that it had never filed required Automation of Reports and Consolidated Orders System (ARCOS) reports. Dr. Bhutani was advised by DEA investigators of the proper reporting procedure for a manufacturer, and the less stringent reporting requirements under a DEA researcher registration. No further action was taken. In his testimony, Dr. Bhutani disputed this version of the events, but Judge Bittner credited the investigator's testimony, while finding Dr. Bhutani's answers to be less than wholly responsive.

In November 1987, DEA investigators conducted another periodic investigation of Respondent.

Investigators determined that Respondent still had not been filing required ARCOS reports since the previous inspection in 1984. Dr. Bhutani attributed this problem to a lack of National Drug Code (NDC) numbers for his product, but Judge Bittner again found the investigator's testimony more credible. Investigators also determined that Respondent did not have a required accurate biennial inventory, and had stored controlled substance raw material in a filing cabinet located in an unsecured and unapproved storage area. As a result of this inspection, DEA issued Respondent a letter of admonition. Respondent represented, in a subsequent letter to DEA, that he had reviewed the inventory records and corrected any errors.

The administrative law judge found that in July 1982, an investigator from the FDA determined that Respondent was not complying with mandated good manufacturing practices (GMPs) and issued a Form 482 list of deficiencies to Respondent. Subsequently, after an inspection in March 1983, FDA issued a notice of adverse findings to Respondent citing non-compliance with tamper-resistant packaging requirements. In December 1983, FDA issued a regulatory letter to Respondent regarding combination over-the-counter drugs. FDA inspections in October 1984 and November 1985 indicated that Respondent was not complying with GMPs. Another regulatory letter was issued in February 1986. Another inspection in that same month disclosed GMP deviations which let the FDA to recommend against using Respondent as a government supplier. Follow-up inspections in May and June 1986 indicated that Respondent was still not in compliance. Afterwards, the FDA considered obtaining an injunction against Respondent, but follow-up inspections in September and October 1986 indicated that Respondent was then sufficiently in compliance. Respondent was found in compliance in December 1986 and January 1987, but at the next scheduled FDA inspection in September and October 1989, GMP deficiencies were again discovered. Another regulatory letter was issued on April 30, 1990. A follow-up inspection in January 1991 revealed deficiencies that resulted in a Complaint for Forfeiture being filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. As a result, Respondent's prescription drug inventory was seized on March 19, 1991. On July 9, 1991, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois found Respondent's drugs to be adulterated. Respondent was permitted to recondition some of these drugs and was permitted to resume operations in November 1991.

An FDA official testified at the hearing in this matter that Respondent's history was one of "just being unable to bring themselves into compliance with GMPs. * * *" Respondent testified that he disagreed with this assessment and had hired a consultant who performed a GMP audit and found only minor problems.

DEA commenced another periodic inspection of Respondent in July 1990, and discovered that Respondent's DEA registration had expired on June 30, 1989. Accordingly, Respondent was illegally selling and in possession of approximately 178,000 dosage units of the Schedule IV controlled substance clorazepate dipotassium. On July 26, 1990, DEA placed Respondent's stock of controlled substances under seal. Additionally, investigators found that Respondent had not filed timely renewal applications from 1984 through 1988. Dr. Bhutani claimed that this was due to clerical oversight.

DEA returned to Respondent on July 31, 1990, and executed a search warrant. This search determined that Respondent was using his secure storage area and safe for the storage of items other than controlled substances in violation of the regulations, and had no documentation of the registration of his controlled substance customers.

On July 26, 1990, Respondent filed an application for a new DEA registration as a manufacturer of Schedule III through V controlled substances. That application is the subject of these proceedings.

The administrative law judge found that in June of 1991, DEA investigators returned to Respondent's facility as part of the evaluation of the pending application. Investigators noted that the facility had been enlarged, that "it was a pretty * * * good looking [plant]", and that there was no controlled substance activity underway. Dr. Bhutani testified that he had designed and completed an addition to his facility in order to meet DEA requirements.

On June 1, 1992, Respondent was registered as a researcher in Schedule III through V by the DEA. Respondent hired a consultant in May 1992 to make recommendations and do follow-up consulting if the application for a manufacturer's registration is approved. This consultant testified at the proceeding that he had made many recommendations and that Respondent appeared ready to adopt procedures which would bring it into compliance with DEA requirements. Dr. Bhutani testified that some of the consultant's recommendations had in fact been implemented as of the date of the hearing.

The administrative law judge found that the Government maintained that over a ten year period, Respondent's failure to comply with GMPs and past experience in handling controlled substances gave no assurance that Respondent could conduct itself consistent with the requirements of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) in the future. The Government further maintained that Dr. Bhutani tended to minimize the severity of Respondent's violations and blame others for its regulatory difficulties. Respondent asserted that its past violations were de minimis or due to inadvertence, and that it had demonstrated itself capable of understanding and meeting DEA requirements.

The Deputy Administrator may deny an application to manufacture controlled substances in Schedules III through V if he determines that the registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(d), "[i]n determining the public interest, the following factors shall be considered:

(1) Maintenance of effective controls against diversion of particular controlled substances and any controlled substance in Schedule III, IV or V compounded therefrom into other than legitimate medical, scientific or industrial channels;

(2) Compliance with applicable State and local law;

(3) Promotion of technical advances in the art of manufacturing these substances and the development of new substances;

(4) Prior conviction record of applicant under Federal or State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of such substances;

(5) Past experience in the manufacture, distribution, and dispensing of controlled substances, and the existence in the establishment of effective controls against diversion; and

(6) Such other factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety."

It is well established that these factors are to be considered in the disjunctive, i.e., the Deputy Administrator may properly rely on any one or a combination of factors, and give each factor the weight he deems appropriate. *Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D.*, 54 FR 16422 (1989).

Of the stated factors, the administrative law judge found that

there is little if any evidence that the Respondent failed to comply with applicable State and local law, or was convicted under Federal or State law, or developed new substances or promoted technical advances. Accordingly, Judge Bittner determined that the first, fifth and sixth factors are relevant to the proceeding.

Under the first and fifth factors, the administrative law judge found that Respondent's past practices with respect to recordkeeping, reporting, and security are clearly relevant. With respect to the sixth factor, the administrative law judge found that Respondent's history of noncompliance with FDA regulations was relevant to the public health and safety. Judge Bittner found that for a number of years, Respondent's compliance with DEA and FDA regulations ranged from poor to abysmal, eventually culminating in seizure of its drug products by both the FDA and DEA. Furthermore, she found that Dr. Bhutani was less than responsive to the regulatory concerns, and tended to hold others responsible for Respondent's failures and to minimize the seriousness of the deficiencies. Judge Bittner concluded that there was a legitimate basis for the Deputy Administrator to find that the registration of the Respondent as a manufacturer of Schedule III through V controlled substances would be inconsistent with the public interest.

However, the administrative law judge recommended, "admittedly with some reservations", that the Respondent's application be granted because the Respondent has undertaken measures to improve its physical security, standard operating procedures, recordkeeping and reporting, and that Dr. Bhutani recognized that compliance with FDA and DEA requirements was mandatory for continued business operation.

The Deputy Administrator adopts the opinion and recommended ruling, findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision of administrative law judge, except as noted below.

The Deputy Administrator finds that with respect to the first and fifth factors, Respondent has failed to maintain proper records and submit reports, failed to ensure that its facility has proper security and that it was properly registered with the DEA as a manufacturer, and illegally possessed and distributed controlled substances.

The Deputy Administrator further finds with respect to the sixth factor that Respondent has a lengthy history of violations of the FD&C GMP regulations related to its activities as a manufacturer of controlled substances. A manufacturer is at the apex of the legitimate controlled substance distribution system, often producing large quantities of the most dangerous drugs of abuse, and making these controlled substances widely available to hundreds of thousands of registered controlled substance handlers for ultimate dispensing to patients. A registrant conducting the business activities of a manufacturer bears some of the heaviest responsibilities under the regulatory scheme of the CSA. Respondent, in its capacity as a manufacturer, has twice been the subject of seizures of its product: once by FDA for its adulteration of drugs, and once by DEA for illegal possession and distribution of controlled substances.

The Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent's President and founder, Dr. Bhutani, has not taken his controlled substance responsibilities seriously; has shown a history and pattern of noncompliance with Federal laws and regulations pertaining to controlled and non-controlled substances; has minimized the importance of compliance with these laws and regulations; and has, throughout the years and in the instant proceedings, been less than wholly responsive, candid, and forthright, thereby failing to evidence the type of direction and leadership to be expected of a manufacturer under the CSA.

The Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent has not shown the commitment to compliance required of a DEA registrant, that its registration as a manufacturer of controlled substances would not be in the public interest, and that its application for registration should be denied.

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 (59 FR 23637), hereby orders that the application for registration of Alra Laboratories, Inc., be, and it hereby is, denied. This order is effective on October 4, 1994.

Dated: September 27, 1994.

Stephen H. Green,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 94-24405 Filed 10-3-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Iran; Current Addresses of Claimants Requested

AGENCY: Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The persons listed in the information section of this notice have claims pending against the Islamic Republic of Iran which are before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (FCSC) for adjudication as authorized under Title V of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987 (Pub. L. 99-93, approved August 16, 1985, 99 Stat. 437 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); the "Iran Claims Act"), and the *Settlement Agreement in Claims of Less than $250,000, Case No. 86 and Case No. B38,* Award No. 483 (1990); the "Settlement Agreement"). However, these persons have failed to inform the FCSC of their current addresses. The claims of the persons listed below will be dismissed by the FCSC, unless current addresses are provided to the FCSC by October 31, 1994.

DATES: The deadline for providing an updated address is October 31, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David E. Bradley, Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, 600 E Street NW., Room 6002, Washington, DC 20579, (202) 616-6975 or FAX (202) 616-6993

David E. Bradley,

Chief Counsel.

Name and last known address	Claim No. IR–
Arman, Joan Y, 1025 Eagle Lake Trail, #907, Port Orange, FL 32019	2177
Black, W. Gail, Route 1, Box 203, Roxboro, NC 27573	2390
Boodey, Madeline P., 907 Acorn Oaks, Austin, TX 78745	1805
Boyadjian, Berge V., 1285 N. Sierra Bonita Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91104	1670
Boyce, Jr., John E., c/o K. Boyce, 4155 Gates Ford Circle, Troy, MI 48098	1716
Cecil, Robert, 2201 No. Moody, Fullerton, CA 92631	2796
Dixon, Pamela Y., 2020 N.E. 30th Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73111	2139
Furnco Construction Corp., c/o R. Emsley, P.O. Box 1545, King of Prussia, PA 19406-0945	2734
Haviland, Wayne E., c/o E. Haviland, 17681 N.W. 54th Ave., Miami, FL 33054	1765
Holmes, Marvin, 3312 Granberry Drive, Dothan, Al 36303	1584
Kinney, Robert W., c/o Parson/Daniel, J.V., P.O. Box 2597, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia	1669
Moschetti, Glenn S., 38/365 SOI 47, Ladpharo Road, Bangkok Thailand	3004
Smith, Jerry L., 547 West Colorado, Amerillo, TX 79108	2044

Name and last known address	Claim No. IR–
Stewart, Van Janet, 8045 Concord Blvd. West, Jacksonville, FL 32208	3078
Stewart, Gerald, P.O. Box 16184, Lake Charles, LA 70616	1140
Svensson, Van William, 112-5 Puwa Place, Kailua, HI 96734	0181
Svensson, Mai, 3106 Granada Avenue, El Monte, CA 91731	0182
Talley, James D., 2012 Marshy Swamp Place, Knoxille, TN 37922	2500
Taylor, Donn E., c/o McDonnell Douglas, P.O. Box 206R, APO New York, NY 09671	3213
Visual Education Consultants, Inc., P.O. Box 52, Madison, WI 53701	0924
Warren, Marjorie Lee, 14104 Panay Way #169, Marina Del Ray, CA 90292	3214
Wire, Miah H., 7276 Sayre Drive, Oakland, CA 94611	3009
Wood, Wilton L., 2320 S. Wood, Dallas, TX 75233	2113
Wood, Mark, 2840 S.W. 342nd Street, Federal Way, WA 98003	1929
Wood, Callie, 2840 S.W. 342nd Street, Federal Way, WA 98003	1929

[FR Doc. 94–24457 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Secretary's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government Through Labor-Management Cooperation: Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of partially closed meeting.

SUMMARY: The Secretary's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government Through Labor-Management Cooperation was established in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (Pub. L. 82–463)). A Notice of Establishment for the Task Force was published in the June 9, 1994, **Federal Register.** Pursuant to Section 10(a) of FACA, this is to announce the first meeting of the Task Force which is to take place on October 19 and 20, 1994.

The purpose of the Task Force is to investigate worker-management relations in the public sector and identify trends in excellence in labor-management cooperation.

Specifically, the Task Force will be asked to address the following questions:

(1) What (if any) new methods or institutions should be encouraged to enhance the quality, productivity and cost-effectiveness of public sector services through labor-management cooperation and employee participation, recognizing the broad variety of functions performed by different levels of government and various other agencies and public organizations?

(2) What (if any) changes to legal frameworks which impact on labor-management relations, including collective bargaining and civil service legislation could be considered to enhance cooperative behaviors that would improve the delivery of services by reducing conflict, duplication and delays?

(3) What (if anything) should be done to increase the extent to which workplace problems are resolved directly by the parties themselves rather than through recourse to administrative bodies and the courts?

(4) What (if anything) can be done to improve the coordination between appropriate executive and legislative bodies to enhance labor-management relations in the public sector and to create a climate where productivity improvement, innovation and risk taking are encouraged and rewarded?

(5) What conditions are necessary to enable elected political leaders, public managers, public employees and labor organizations to work together to achieve excellence in state and local government? What (if any) are the obstacles, and how can they be overcome?

(6) What examples of successful cooperative efforts are appropriate to serve as public sector models? Why have some initially successful efforts failed, and what can be done to enhance prospects for success?

TIME AND PLACE: The meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 19 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., in the Great Hall and Thursday, October 20 from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. in Conference Room N–3437 A–D in the Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

AGENDA: The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

(a) Introduction of Task Force Members
(b) Legal Guidance from the Solicitor
(c) Guidance to the Task Force by the Secretary of Labor
(d) Statements by experts regarding Excellence and Labor-Management Cooperation
(e) Inquiries by Task Force members of experts
(f) Comments by interested parties on Task Force objectives (time permitting)
(g) Discussion of Task Force objectives, including, to the extent practicable, delineation of specific tasks and projected time frames for achieving such objectives
(h) Ancillary items attendant to Task Force activities.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: The meeting will be open to the public from 9 a.m. to 12 noon and from 1:45 p.m. until 4 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19 and from 9 a.m. to 12 noon and from 1:45 p.m. until 3 p.m. on Thursday, October 20. Seating will be available to the public on a first-come, first-serve basis. Handicapped individuals wishing to attend should contact the Task Force to obtain appropriate accommodations. Individuals or organizations wishing to submit written statements should send 15 copies to Mr. Charles A. Richards, Designated Federal Official, Secretary of Labor's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government through Labor-Management Cooperation, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, room S–2203, Washington, DC 20210. These statements will be thoroughly reviewed and become part of the record. At this stage, the Task Force is primarily interested in statements that suggest ingredients or impediments to excellence in state and local government, or which suggest other closely related areas which the Task Force might usefully review.

CLOSED PORTION OF THE MEETING: From 12 noon until 1:45 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19, and Thursday, October 20, the Task Force will meet in closed session in order to discuss internal personnel rules and practices of the Task Force, as well as personal information. This closing of the meeting is authorized by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and 5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(2) and (c)(6). Personnel matters and personal matters are protected from disclosure by exemptions 2 and 6, respectively, of section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Charles A. Richards, Designated Federal Official, Secretary of Labor's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government through Labor-Management Cooperation, U.S. Department of Labor, room S–2203, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 219–6231.

Signed at Washington, DC this 28th day of September 1994.

Robert B. Reich,

Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 94–24487 Filed 10–3–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–23–M