

Chief, Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1387 South Vinnell Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709-1657.

Dated: August 1, 1997.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 97-21689 Filed 8-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[NM-952-07-1420-00]

#### Notice of Filing of Plat of Survey; New Mexico

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The plat of survey described below will be officially filed in the New Mexico State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Santa Fe, New Mexico, on September 5, 1997.

New Mexico Principal Meridian, New Mexico:

Township 16 North, Range 7 East,  
accepted August 4, 1997, for Group  
942 NM.

If a protest against a survey, as shown on the above plat is received prior to the date of official filing, the filing will be stayed pending consideration of the protest. A plat will not be officially filed until the day after all protests have been dismissed and become final or appeals from the dismissal affirmed.

A person or party who wishes to protest against any of this survey must file a written protest with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, stating that they wish to protest.

A statement of reasons for a protest may be filed with the notice of protest to the State Director, or the statement of reasons must be filed with the State Director within thirty (30) days after the protest is filed.

The above listed plat represents dependent resurveys, surveys, and subdivisions.

This plat will be available in the New Mexico State Office, Bureau of Land Management for public inspection, P.O. Box 27115, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502-0115. Copies may be obtained from this office upon payment of \$1.10 per sheet.

Dated August 5, 1997.

**John P. Bennett,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor For New Mexico.*

[FR Doc. 97-21642 Filed 8-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-FB-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

[DEA #153F]

#### Controlled Substances: Revised Aggregate Production Quotas for 1997

**AGENCY:** Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of final revised aggregate production quotas for 1997.

**SUMMARY:** This notice establishes revised 1997 aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II of the Controlled Substances Act.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 15, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Frank L. Sapienza, Chief, Drug and Chemical Evaluation Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, D.C. 20537, Telephone: (202) 307-7183.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 826) requires that the Attorney General establish aggregate production quotas for each basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedules I and II. This responsibility has been delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by § 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Administrator, in turn, has redelegated this function to the Acting Deputy Administrator pursuant to § 0.104 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

On June 5, 1997, a notice of the proposed revised 1997 aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II was published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 30883). All interested parties were invited to comment on or object to these proposed aggregate production quotas on or before July 7, 1997.

Several companies commented that the revised 1997 aggregate production quotas for amphetamine, difenoxin, diphenoxylate, methadone intermediate, N-ethylamphetamine, noracymethadol, oxycodone, oxymorphone and pentobarbital were insufficient to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States, for export requirements and for the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks.

DEA has reviewed the involved companies' 1996 year-end inventories, their initial 1997 manufacturing quotas, 1997 export requirements and their actual and projected 1997 sales. Based on this data, the DEA has adjusted the revised 1997 aggregate production

quotas for difenoxin, diphenoxylate, N-ethylamphetamine, noracymethadol, oxycodone, oxymorphone and pentobarbital to meet the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States.

Regarding amphetamine and methadone intermediate, the DEA has determined that no adjustments of the aggregate production quotas are necessary to meet the 1997 estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States.

Based on recent data submitted by two companies, DEA has adjusted the revised 1997 aggregate production quotas for hydromorphone and lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) to meet the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States.

The Office of Management and Budget has determined that notices of aggregate production quotas are not subject to centralized review under Executive Order 12866. This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that this matter does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The Acting Deputy Administrator hereby certifies that this action will have no significant impact upon small entities whose interests must be considered under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The establishment of aggregate production quotas for Schedule I and II controlled substances is mandated by law and by international treaty obligations. Aggregate production quotas apply to approximately 200 DEA registered bulk and dosage from manufacturers of Schedule I and II controlled substances. The quotas are necessary to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States, for export requirements and the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks. While aggregate production quotas are of primary importance to large manufacturers, their impact upon small entities is neither negative nor beneficial. Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator has determined that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Therefore, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 826), delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by § 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and redelegated to the Acting Deputy Administrator pursuant to § 0.104 of Title 28 of the Code of