United States of America, Counterdefendant, Civil Action No. 92–4032, was lodged on December 15, 1995, with the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota, Southern Division. The proposed consent decree requires Tri-State Mint, Inc., Tri-State Professional Recovery, Inc., Von Hoff International, Inc., and Robert Hoff, the former owners/operators of the Tri-State Mint C Avenue site located in Sioux Falls, South Dakota (''Site''), to pay the United States $820,000.00 (plus specified interest accrued from August 17, 1995, through the date of payment) in reimbursement of the United States' past response costs incurred in connection with the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the Site. General Properties Corporation, one of the original defendants in this civil action, was dismissed from this lawsuit on or about November 23, 1993, and is not a party to this Consent Decree.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States of America, Plaintiff* v. *Tri-State Mint, Inc. et al., Defendants/Counterclaimants* v. *United States of America, Counterdefendant*, DOJ Ref. #90–11–3–696.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, District of South Dakota, 230 S. Phillips Ave. #600 57102; the Region VIII Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 999 18th Street—Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy of the proposed decree and attachment, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $5.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), for each copy. The check should be made payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 96–601 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—The Frame Relay Forum

Notice is hereby given that, on June 16, 1995, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), The Frame Relay Forum (''FRF'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the identities of the new members of FRF are: PCSI, San Diego, CA; Computerm Corporation, Pittsburgh, PA; Southern New England Telephone, Newhaven, CT; DIGI International, Eden Prairie, MN; ADTRAN, Huntsville, AL; and US Robotics Corporation, Skokie, IL. New auditing members are: Polish Telecom, Warsaw, POLAND; and BRAK Systems, Inc., Mississauga, Ontario, CANADA. Companies who are no longer members are: CBIS and LightStream.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activities of FRF. Membership remains open, and FRF intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 10, 1992, FRF filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on July 2, 1992 (57 FR 29537).

The last notification was filed with the Department on March 20, 1995. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 31, 1995 (60 FR 28430).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96–602 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company

Notice is hereby given that, on June 21, 1995, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company (''3M'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objective of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are: Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, St. Paul, MN; and Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Company, a division of Lockheed Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, Marietta, GA. The nature and purpose of the venture is to develop film products and associated products and techniques which can replace paint on aircraft exteriors in order to preserve the physical aircraft integrity within regulatory constraints and within feasible economic means.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96–603 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 94–41]

Homayoun Homayouni, M.D.; Continuation of Registration With Restrictions

On March 21, 1994, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Homayoun Homayouni, M.D., (Respondent), of Northfield, New Jersey, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, BH0295748, under 21 U.S.C. § 824(a)(4), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. § 823(f), as being inconsistent with the public interest. Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged that:

1. On at least six occasions between November 1988 and March 1989 [the Respondent] allegedly wrote prescriptions for controlled substances to undercover officers without a legitimate medical reason in exchange for cash and failed to maintain medical records of the transactions.

2. On April 14, 1989, the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners (Medical Board) temporarily suspended [the Respondent's] license to practice medicine and surgery because of the aforementioned allegations.

3. On August 9, 1989, the Medical Board suspended [the Respondent's] state medical license for five years, the first two years active and the remainder as a period of probation. In addition, [the Respondent was] ordered to pay the sum of $12,145.35 in

penalties and trial costs, to contribute 300 hours of community service, and [to] complete a mini-residency in appropriate prescribing of Controlled Dangerous Substances.

4. On December 1, 1989, [the Respondent was] convicted, on a guilty plea, of one count of failure to keep records of distribution of drugs (Vicodin, Hydrocodone Bitartrate, Tylenol) in New Jersey Superior Court, Atlantic County, and sentenced to two years probation, a $10,000.00 fine, and 200 hours [of] community service.

5. On April 16, 1991, the Medical Board reinstated [the Respondent's] state medical license. Shortly thereafter, the New Jersey State Department of Health, Division of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse[,] renewed [the Respondent's] expired New Jersey Controlled Dangerous Substance registration.

On April 14, 1994, the Respondent, through counsel, filed a timely request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on March 7–8, 1995, before Administrative Law Judge Paul A. Tenney. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence, and after the hearing, counsel for both sides submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On June 5, 1995, Judge Tenney issued his Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Ruling, recommending that the Deputy Administrator permit the Respondent to retain his DEA Certificate of Registration. Neither party filed exceptions to his decision, and on July 17, 1995, Judge Tenney transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator.

The Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator adopts, with noted exceptions, the opinion and recommended ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and 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 Deputy Administrator finds that the Respondent is licensed to practice medicine in New Jersey. He was born and educated in Iran, but he performed his internship and residency training in the United States. In late 1987, the Respondent established a private practice in Atlantic County, New Jersey.

In late 1988 and early 1989, an undercover investigation was initiated in which an informant (Informant) working for the Atlantic County Prosecutors Office met with the Respondent on November 21, 1988, and on November 29, 1988. At these two meetings, the Respondent provided the Informant with prescriptions for controlled substances, including Tylenol No. 3, Valium, and Vicodin, and at each visit, the Informant paid the Respondent $50.00 for the prescriptions. The Informant tape recorded these transactions, and Judge Tenney admitted transcripts of these recordings into evidence. At each meeting, no medical examination was conducted, and the Informant presented no medical symptoms or complaints. At the November 29, 1988 meeting, the Respondent told the Informant, ''don't come too frequent, it makes it *suspicious*.'' (Emphasis added). The parties stipulated that Valium, a brand name for diazepam, is a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.14(c), Tylenol No. 3 is a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.13, and Vicodin is a brand name for a product containing hydrocodone bitartrate, which is a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.13(e).

On December 5, 1988, the Respondent met with an investigator, (Investigator), who had identified herself as a friend of the Informant. The Investigator requested a prescription for Fiorinal, a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.13. During her conversation with the Respondent, the Investigator twice denied that she suffered from headaches. However, the Respondent wrote a prescription for Fiorinal, and she paid him $50.00 for the prescription. On December 16, 1988, the Investigator unsuccessfully tried to obtain a prescription from the Respondent for Vicodin for the Informant, and Dilaudid for herself. However, the Respondent did give her a prescription for Fiorinal, writing on the prescription that the medication was ''for migraine headache only.''

On January 12, 1989, the Investigator, accompanied by a Sergeant from her office, visited the Respondent, and he issued prescriptions for Fiorinal for the Investigator, and diazepam, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.14(c), for the Sergeant. They paid the Respondent $100.00. The Respondent questioned the Sergeant as to whether she had made any ''suicide attempts or anything.'' the Sergeant responded ''[n]o.'' However, the Respondent took no further medical history nor performed any medical examination. On January 24, 1989, the Sergeant again met with the Respondent, and she did not inform him of any symptoms necessitating medication. However, the Respondent gave her a prescription for Fiorinal and diazepam. On March 2, 1989, both the Investigator and the Sergeant returned to the Respondent's office, and he asked the Investigator whether she had any headaches, to which she replied ''No.'' The Respondent continued to question why she wanted a prescription for Fiorinal, and the Investigator stated that it ''relaxed'' her. The Respondent explained that he wanted to change the Investigator's medication, stating: ''Yea, let me change a little the category of the medication *so you don't get caught and you don't get questioned and eh, it would be better for me, as well.*'' (Emphasis added). He then changed her prescription to Xanax, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 1308.14(c), and he changed the Sergeant's prescription to Tranxene, also a Schedule IV controlled substance.

On the same day, after that transaction, a search warrant was executed by a Captain of the Atlantic County Prosecutors Office, and he recovered from the Respondent's wallet the $100.00 paid by the Investigator and the Sergeant for their prescriptions. Although the officers searched for patient records pertaining to the Investigator and the Sergeant, none were found.

At the hearing before Judge Tenney, the Respondent asserted that the Informant had ''fooled'' him, and that he had not suspected anything illicit in his motives for wanting controlled substances. The Respondent also testified that the Informant had told him that the Investigator suffered from migraine headaches, and that she usually took Fiorinal for relief. He denied hearing the Investigator's negative response to his question concerning migraine headaches, asserting instead that he thought she had said ''yes'' to his headache question. In his opinion, Judge Tenney noted that ''From a cultural standpoint, [the Respondent] was somewhat unfamiliar with the presence and habits of drug-abusers in the United States of America in 1988–89. He also has some problems with the English language.''

On March 15, 1989, the Attorney General of New Jersey filed with the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners (Medical Board) an application for a temporary suspension of the Respondent's license to practice medicine. He also filed a Verified Complaint and Application (Complaint) which listed various charges against the Respondent based on allegations that he had issued prescriptions between December of 1988 and March of 1989 to undercover officers without adequate

examination or medical justification, and without maintaining any medical records. In April of 1989, the Medical Board issued an order temporarily suspending the Respondent's medical license pending a State administrative hearing on the Complaint. In that Order, the Medical Board wrote:

> The Board has undertaken to review the evidence, particularly the transcripts of the visits by the undercover investigators. The Board finds sufficient indicia to conclude that these five visits amount to nothing more than commercial transactions, exchanging fifty dollars for each of the eight substances prescribed. From the start, it would seem apparent that the doctors knew or should have known that the patient [Investigator] presented no symptomology which would warrant the issuance of a prescription for Fiorinal. . . . Their visit together is totally devoid of any medical information. . . . His first interaction with patient [Sergeant] was similarly devoid of any effort to elicit from her any medical symptomology which might explain her desire to obtain medication. His willingness to give patient [Sergeant] a prescription for two medications when he knew that the Fiorinal was intended for use by patient [Investigator], is further evidence of his willingness to use his licensure privileges in exchange for money. . . . *In the Board's view, the cash transactions represented by the eight counts of the Complaint have all the trappings of a ''drug deal.''*
>
> Our review of these facts, coupled with the doctor's post arrest interview, his acknowledgement of the authenticity of the prescriptions and his failure to have created a treatment record with regard to these patients, leads us to the inescapable conclusion that the doctor has failed to exercise sufficient judgment so that we can trust his ability to render safe medical care to his patients.
>
> (Emphasis added)

Prior to a State administrative hearing on the allegations contained in the Complaint, the Respondent indicated his willingness to plead ''no contest'' and to seek resolution of the matter through a consensual agreement. The Board agreed, issuing an Order on August 9, 1989, which contained the following mutually agreed upon conditions: suspension of the Respondent's medical license for five years—two years' active and total suspension, and three years of probation, provided the Respondent complies with stated conditions; payment of a fine and costs totalling $12,145.35; contribution of 300 hours of community service; successful completion of a mini-residency course on the appropriate procedures for prescribing controlled dangerous substances; and attendance at a status conference prior to reinstatement of his license, so that the Respondent can demonstrate his ''capacity and competence to re-enter the practice of medicine and surgery and his familiarity with and understanding of the laws and rules specifically applicable to licensees of this Board.''

On October 12, 1989, as part of a plea bargain, the Respondent pled guilty in State court to a New Jersey controlled dangerous substances record-keeping violation. He was sentenced to two years' probation, 200 hours of community service, and a fine of $10,000.00.

As of April 16, 1994, the Respondent's medical license was restored without limitation. By letter, the Executive Director of the Medical Board wrote: ''According to Board records, after the conclusion of the active period of suspension, [the Respondent] resumed medical practice under the probationary period, and all provisions of the Order have been satisfactorily completed.'' Therefore, the Board deemed the Respondent ''eligible'' to be a DEA registrant, while acknowledging that ''the granting of that privilege [rested] solely within the authority of the [DEA].'' Further, the parties stipulated, and testimony was received at the hearing before Judge Tenney, that since 1989, the DEA had conducted no further investigations, had no knowledge of any future allegations regarding the Respondent and his handling of controlled substances, and knew of no further investigations or allegations by the Atlantic County's Prosecutor's Office of misconduct pertaining to the Respondent's practice. Also, no complaints or malpractice suits had been filed against the Respondent concerning the quality of his medical services. The record also contains numerous written documents from individuals, including colleagues and patients, writing to support the Respondent's application and to attest to the fact that he is a caring and compassionate physician.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4), the Deputy Administrator may revoke a DEA Certificate of Registration and deny any pending applications, if he determines that the continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. Section 823(f) requires that the following factors be considered:

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

(2) The applicant's experience in dispensing, or conducting research will 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 or 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 denied. See *Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D.*, Docket No. 88–42, 54 Fed. Reg. 16,422 (1989).

In this case, all five factors are relevant in determining whether the Respondent's continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. As to factor one, ''recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board,'' the Medical Board issued a temporary suspension of the Respondent's medical license within weeks of his arrest in March of 1989. Further, the Medical Board ultimately suspended the Respondent's medical license for two years and placed it in a probationary status subject to ordered conditions. However, on April 16, 1994, the Respondent's medical license was restored without restrictions, and evidence was presented to show that the Respondent complied with all ordered conditions, to include the successful completion of a mini-residency course dealing with the procedures to follow for the appropriate prescribing of controlled dangerous substances. The Medical Board also wrote that it deemed the Respondent ''eligible'' to be a DEA registrant. Judge Tenney also noted that ''it is clear that the 'recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board or professional disciplinary authority' strongly favors the Respondent. . . . Thus, the State of New Jersey no longer believes that the Respondent is a danger to the public.''

As to factor two, the Respondent's ''experience in dispensing . . . controlled substances,'' the Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Tenney's conclusion that ''[b]ased on the evidence presented at the hearing, there can be no doubt that the Respondent's practice of dispensing controlled substances to the under cover officers was woefully inadequate. He dispensed controlled substances absent appropriate indications that the substances were medically necessary, and he failed to document the dispensation.'' Further, the observations by the Medical Board, that the Respondent's conduct in 1988 and 1989 was analogous to ''commercial transactions'' or a ''drug deal,'' were substantiated by the transcripts of the

individual interactions between the Respondent, the Informant, the Investigator, and the Sergeant. The Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Tenney's conclusion, that ''notwithstanding any evidence that tends to favor the Respondent, a preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that the Respondent knowingly dispensed controlled substances for illegitimate purposes.''

However, the evidence also shows that since the Respondent's probationary reinstatement of his medical license in April of 1991, no investigations or allegations have been raised concerning the Respondent's dispensing of controlled substances. Further, the evidence supports a conclusion that the Respondent has also completed remedial training relevant to his handling of controlled substances. Again, the Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Tenney's conclusion that ''the Respondent's illicit behavior in 1988–89 is minimized by his conduct since that time.''

As to factor three, the Respondent's ''conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to . . . dispensing of controlled substances,'' the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent pled guilty on October 12, 1989, to a New Jersey controlled dangerous substances record-keeping violation, and he was sentenced to two years' probation, 200 hours of community service, and a monetary fine. The Respondent's ''conviction record'' is thus relevant in determining the public's interest in his continued registration with the DEA.

As to factor four, the Respondent's ''[c]ompliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances,'' the Government argued that the Respondent violated State law in his dispensing activities in 1988 and 1989, as found by the Medical Board. However, Judge Tenney noted that the Government ''[did] not reference, or provide the text of, any specific statutes with which the Respondent allegedly failed to comply, nor does it point to any State entity's finding that the Respondent violated any laws other than the record-keeping provision discussed under factor (3)'' as pertaining to his State conviction. Thus, the Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Tenney's conclusion that factor four is of limited significance given the evidence of record.

As to factor five, ''[s]uch other conduct which may threaten the public health or safety,'' the Deputy Administrator finds relevant an observation made by Judge Tenney that the DEA took no action against the Respondent's registration while he was actively suspended from practicing medicine by the New Jersey Medical Board. Further, he noted that ''[t]he delay from April of 1991 until March of 1994, however, tends to suggest, albeit slightly, that the DEA did not consider the Respondent to be a serious threat to the public health and safety.''

Further, the Government argues that the Respondent remains ''unable or unwilling to understand or admit the true nature of the activities for which the government issued a show cause [order].'' Judge Tenney noted that, based upon the Respondent's testimony before him, ''[t]here is little doubt that the Respondent is still under the illusion that he was an innocent participant in the 1988–89 undercover transactions.'' However, the evidence supports a contrary finding, for the transcripts of the exchanges between the Respondent and the undercover investigators clearly show that the Respondent was aware that he was prescribing controlled substances for illegitimate purposes. Significant was the Respondent's change of controlled substances prescribed to the Investigator and the Sergeant, and his statement, ''Yea, let me change a little the category of the medication so you don't get caught and you don't get questioned and eh, it would be better for me, as well.'' No mention was made of a legitimate medical purpose for prescribing controlled substances in this instance or to substantiate the change in medication prescribed. Such evidence makes the Respondent's contention that he was an innocent ''fooled'' by the assertions of his patients incredible.

However, the Deputy Administrator also finds compelling Judge Tenney's observations concerning the Respondent's credible remorse for his misconduct. He wrote that the Respondent, an Iranian by birth, was ''a proud man, who sincerely [was] ashamed of his conduct, even though his pride apparently contribute[d] to his inability to be completely candid regarding that conduct.'' Furthermore, the Respondent also provided extensive evidence from colleagues and patients of his caring and compassionate treatment of his patients. Also, the record contains no evidence of any investigation or allegations of misconduct regarding the Respondent's medical practices since 1989.

In analyzing this diverse evidence relevant to the Respondent's likely future conduct and the public interest, Judge Tenney emphasized the unique nature of this case. Specifically, he noted that in previous cases, when a respondent had failed to admit to the full extent of his involvement in documented misconduct involving controlled substances, Judge Tenney had then discounted the testimony of that respondent and doubted such a respondent's commitment to compliance with the Controlled Substances Act in future practice. *See, e.g., Prince George Daniels, D.D.S.*, Docket No. 94–23, 60 Fed. Reg. 62,884 (1995); *Albert L. Pulliam, M.D.*, Docket No. 94–11, 60 Fed. Reg. 54,513 (1995). Here, however, Judge Tenney found that the weight of the evidence favored the continued registration of this Respondent because of the unique circumstances of his case.

The Deputy Administrator, in considering all the evidence and the submission of the parties, agrees with Judge Tenney and concludes that the Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration should not be revoked at this time. However, he also finds that the imposition of certain restrictions upon the Respondent's continued registration will ''allow the Respondent to demonstrate that he can responsibly handle controlled substances in his medical practice, yet simultaneously protect the public by providing a mechanism for rapid detection of any improper activity related to controlled substances.'' *Steven M. Gardner, M.D.*, Docket No. 85–26, 51 Fed. Reg. 12,576 (1986). Specifically, the Respondent is to maintain a log of all controlled substance prescriptions issued or authorized by him for a period of two years from the date of this Order's publication in the Federal Register. He is also to provide a copy of this log on a quarterly basis to the Special Agent in Charge of the DEA Newark Field Division, or his designee, and this individual, consistent with this Order, will determine specific data to be recorded on this log. Therefore, the Deputy Administrator finds that the public interest is best served by continuing the Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration subject to compliance with the above enumerated requirements.

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 Certificate of Registration BH0295748, issued to Homayoun Homayouni, M.D., be continued, and any pending applications be granted, with the above restrictions. This order is effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

Dated: January 4, 1996.

Stephen H. Greene,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–465 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

Federal Bureau of Investigation

DNA Advisory Board Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is hereby given that the DNA Advisory Board (DAB) will meet on February 1, 1996, from 9 am until 5 pm at The Crystal City Marriott, Potomac Ballroom, 1999 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202. All attendees will be admitted only after displaying personal identification which bears a photograph of the attendee.

The DAB's scope of authority is: To develop, and if appropriate, periodically revise, recommended standards for quality assurance to the Director of the FBI, including standards for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analysis of DNA; To recommend standards to the Director of the FBI which specify criteria for quality assurance and proficiency tests to be applied to the various types of DNA analysis used by forensic laboratories, including statistical and population genetics issues affecting the evaluation of the frequency of occurrence of DNA profiles calculated from pertinent population database(s); To recommend standards for acceptance of DNA profiles in the FBI's Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) which take account of relevant privacy, law enforcement and technical issues; and, To make recommendations for a system for grading proficiency testing performance to determine whether a laboratory is performing acceptably.

The topics to be discussed at this meeting include: a review of minutes from the September 1995 meeting; a discussion and adoption of DAB by-laws; a review and discussion of DNA standards-related issues; a discussion of population statistics issues; a presentation by the American Board of Criminalistics; a presentation concerning the NIJ-solicited DNA proficiency testing study; and a discussion of topics for the next DNA Advisory Board meeting.

The meeting is open to the public on a first-come, first seated basis. Anyone wishing to address the DAB must notify the Designated Federal Employee (DFE) in writing at least twenty-four hours before the DAB meets. The notification must include the requestor's name, organizational affiliation, a short statement describing the topic to be addressed, and the amount of time requested. Oral statements to the DAB will be limited to five minutes and limited to subject matter directly related to the DAB's agenda, unless otherwise permitted by the Chairman.

Any member of the public may file a written statement for the record concerning the DAB and its work before or after the meeting. Written statements for the record will be furnished to each DAB member for their consideration and will be included in the official minutes of a DAB meeting. Written statements must be type-written on 8½″ × 11″ xerographic weight paper, one side only, and bound only by a paper clip (not stapled). All pages must be numbered. Statements should include the Name, Organizational Affiliation, Address, and Telephone number of the author(s). Written statements for the record will be included in minutes of the meeting immediately following the receipt of the written statement, unless the statement is received within three weeks of the meeting. Under this circumstance, the written statement will be included with the minutes of the following meeting. Written statements for the record should be submitted to the DFE.

Inquiries may be addressed to the DFE, Dr. Randall S. Murch, Chief, Scientific Analysis Section, Laboratory Division, Tenth Street Northwest, Washington, D. C. 20535, (202) 324–4416, FAX (202) 324–1462.

Dated: January 11, 1996.

Randall S. Murch,

Chief, Scientific Analysis Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[FR Doc. 96–634 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

National Skill Standards Board; Notice of Open Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of re-scheduled open meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Skill Standards Board was established by an Act of Congress, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, Title V, Pub. L. 103–227. The 28-member National Skill Standards Board will serve as a catalyst and be responsible for the development and implementation of a national system of voluntary skill standards and certification through voluntary partnerships which have the full and balanced participation of business, industry, labor, education and other key groups.

TIME AND PLACE: The meeting will be held from 8 a.m. to approximately 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 22, 1996, in the Dolly Madison Ballroom, 2nd Floor of the Madison Hotel at 15th & M Streets N.W., Washington, D.C.

AGENDA: The agenda for the Board Meeting will include presentations on Existing Occupational Classification Systems, and Education and Employer collaboration with the National Skill Standards Board.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: The meeting from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., is open to the public. Seating is limited and will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Seats will be reserved for the media. Disabled individuals should contact Claire Grenewald at (202) 254–8628, if special accommodations are needed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Claire Grenewald at (202) 254–8628.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 11th day of January, 1996.

Judy Gray,

Executive Director, National Skill Standards Board.

[FR Doc. 96–577 Filed 1–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–23–M

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Proposed Information Collection Request Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations; Consumer Price Index Commodities and Services Survey

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance 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. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden is minimized, reporting forms 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 ''Consumer Price Index Commodities and Services Survey.''