plan development. The Service will consider all information presented during the public comment period prior to approval of each new or revised Recovery Plan. Substantiative technical comments will result in changes to the plans. Substantive comments regarding recovery plan implementation may not necessarily result in changes to the recovery plans, but will be forwarded to appropriate Federal or other entities so that they can take these comments into account during the course of implementing recovery actions. Individualized responses to comments will not be provided.

The western lily (*Lilium occidentale*) is a distinctive and spectacular species in a genus known for its striking beauty and horticultural appeal. The range of the western lily is very limited, and its habitat and ecosystem processes have been dramatically altered this century. The western lily is limited to low lying poorly drained areas along a narrow band of the Pacific Coast, no more than 4 miles inland, from Humboldt Bay near Eureka, California on the south, north some 200 miles to Coos Bay Oregon. Many western lily western lily populations and much of its habitat have been lost to various forms of development, including agricultural uses (pasture or cranberry bogs) and infrastructure projects (roads, campgrounds, and utilities). Western lily has been reported from approximately 58 sites, 20 of which appear to have been extirpated.

The objective of this plan is to provide a framework for the recovery of the western lily so that its protection by the ESA is no longer necessary. Actions necessary for the prevention of extinction of this plant include conservation and management of existing sites, by maintaining shrubby vegetation with openings and preventing encroachment by trees. The plan also recommends establishment of a seed bank and development of methods to reintroduce the plant to suitable sites or augment existing wild populations. The plan also is intended to encourage public awareness, understanding and participation in western lily recovery.

Public Comments Solicited

The Service solicits written comments on the western lily recovery plan. All comments received by the date specified above will be considered prior to approval of these plans.

Authority

The authority for this action is section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1533(f).

Dated: August 5, 1997.

Thomas J. Dwyer,

Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.

[FR Doc. 97–23585 Filed 9–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, DOI.

ACTION: Notice of information collection solicitation.

SUMMARY: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Minerals Management Service (MMS) is soliciting comments on an information collection, Training and Outreach Evaluation Questionnaires.

FORM: MMS–4420, A–H.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before November 4, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments sent via the U.S. Postal Service should be sent to Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Publications Staff, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3021, Denver, Colorado 80225–0165; courier address is Building 85, Room A–212, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225; e:mail address is David__Guzy@mms.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis C. Jones, Rules and Publications Staff, phone (303) 231–3046, FAX (303) 231–3385, e-mail Dennis__C__Jones@mms.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Section 3506(c)(2)(A), we are notifying you, members of the public and affected agencies, of this collection of information and are inviting your comments. Is this information collection necessary for us to properly do our job? Have we accurately estimated the industry burden for responding to this collection? Can we enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information we collect? Can we lessen the burden of this information collection on the respondents by using automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

Executive Order No. 12862, September 11, 1993, Setting Customer Service Standards, provided renewed focus on surveying customers. The MMS Royalty Management Program (RMP) uses training and outreach evaluation questionnaires as one method of surveying customers about levels of satisfaction.

The RMP frequently provides training and outreach to its constituents to facilitate their compliance with laws and regulations and to ensure that constituents are well informed. In 1996 we presented over 20 training sessions to the oil and gas and solid minerals reporters on various aspects of royalty reporting, production reporting, and valuation. We also provided over 30 outreach sessions to individual Indian minerals owners, Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs on Indian royalty management issues. Additionally, we provided several sessions of relevant training to our financial and systems contractors and State and Tribal auditors.

At the end of a training or outreach session, RMP asks participants to complete and return evaluation questionnaires; participant response is voluntary. Some questions are uniform across all of the evaluation questionnaires; some are specific to each type of training or outreach. We use the feedback from these questionnaires to enhance future training and outreach and to improve RMP's overall service. We request feedback on several areas of our training and outreach sessions, including:

- Organization of training.
- Level of detail.
- Clarity of presentation.
- Achievement of training objectives.
- Relevance of subject matter.
- Effectiveness of training materials.
- Other topic suggestions for future sessions.
- Overall RMP customer service.

We estimate that the annual burden to our constituents is 180 hours, assuming that all training and outreach participants respond to these evaluations and each evaluation questionnaire takes 6 minutes to complete (1800 participants × 6 minutes = 10,800 minutes or 180 hours).

Dated August 26, 1997.

Lucy Querques Denett,

Associate Director for Royalty Management.

[FR Doc. 97–23573 Filed 9–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service (MMS), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of a new information collection.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, MMS invites the public and other Federal agencies to comment on a proposal to request approval of the new collection of information discussed below. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

DATES: Submit written comments by November 4, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to the Rules Processing Team, Minerals Management Service, Mail Stop 4020, 381 Elden Street, Herndon, Virginia 20170–4817.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexis London, Rules Processing Team, telephone (703) 787–1600. You may also contact Alexis London to obtain a copy of the proposed collection of information at no cost.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: NTL—Performance Measures for OCS Operators and MMS Form XXX.

OMB Control Number: 1010–NEW.

Abstract: The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA), at 43 U.S.C. 1331 *et seq.*, requires the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to preserve, protect, and develop oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); make such resources available to meet the Nation's energy needs as rapidly as possible; balance orderly energy resource development with protection of the human, marine, and coastal environment; ensure the public a fair and equitable return on the resources offshore; and preserve and maintain free enterprise competition.

In a collaborative effort with representatives of 17 oil and gas companies, representatives of five trade associations (American Petroleum Institute, Offshore Operators Committee, International Petroleum Association of America, International Association of Drilling Contractors, and National Ocean Industries Association), and the Coast Guard, MMS developed a set of performance measures intended to (1) determine if OCS safety and environmental performance is improving over time through the implementation of the Safety and Environmental Management Program (SEMP) on the OCS, (2) provide an industry average and range for various quantitative measures against which companies can compare themselves, (3) give MMS assurance that an operator's safety and environmental performance is improving, and (4) provide comparison data on which companies with good performance can base requests to MMS for specific regulatory relief.

Like the implementation of SEMP, participation in the performance measures effort is voluntary. However, the quality of the information that can be garnered from analysis of the data depends on the widespread support of this effort. The MMS currently collects a great deal of information under regulation. It does not have, but intends to collect on a voluntary basis, information that will be described in a new Notice to Lessees on Performance Measures for OCS Operators. The information proposed for collection will consist of:

(a) Separated by Production Operations, Drilling Operations, and Construction Operations:

- Number of company employee recordable accidents,
- Number of contract employee recordable accidents,
- Total number of recordable accidents,
- Number of company employee lost time accidents,
- Number of contract employee lost time accidents,
- Total number of lost time accidents,
- Company employee hours worked,
- Contract employee hours worked,
- Total hours worked,
- Total recordable incidence rate (by formula provided),
- Total lost time incidence rate (by formula provided).

(b) By totals

- Number of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) reported exceedances,
- EPA NPDES discharge incidence rate,
- Oil spills <1 bbl by number and volume.

Data will be collected for calendar years 1996 and 1997 in the first quarter of calendar 1997. Requests for information for subsequent years will be made at the end of each year. It is expected that some companies will not have complete information for the first submission. They will be requested to provide as complete information as possible and to make adjustments as necessary to improve reporting in subsequent collections.

The MMS will use the information collected to work with industry representatives to identify ''pacesetter'' companies and request them to make presentations at periodic workshops. Knowing how the offshore operators as a group are doing and where their own company ranks will provide company management with information to focus their continuous improvement efforts. This should lead to more cost-effective prevention actions. This information will also provide offshore operators and organizations with a credible data source to demonstrate how well the industry and individual companies are doing to those outside the industry. The MMS can better focus its regulatory and research programs on areas where the performance measures indicate that operators are having difficulty meeting MMS expectations. The MMS should be more effective in leveraging its resources by redirecting research efforts, promoting appropriate regulatory initiatives, and shifting inspection program emphasis. The performance measures will also give MMS a verifiable gauge against which to judge the reasonableness of company requests for specific regulatory relief. They will provide a starting point for the dialog.

If respondents submit confidential or proprietary information, MMS will protect such information in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act; 30 CFR 250.18, Data and information to be made available to the public; and 30 CFR Part 252, OCS Oil and Gas Information Program. No items of a sensitive nature are collected. The requirement to respond is voluntary.

Frequency: Annual.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: 130 Federal OCS oil and gas or sulphur lessees.

Estimated Average Hour Burden: 16–32 burden hours per response. This number is expected to decrease as respondents become more familiar with the performance measures.

Estimated Average Cost Burden: The MMS has identified no cost burdens on respondents for providing this information.

Comments: The MMS will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in its submission for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. We will also consult with a representative sample of respondents. As a result of these efforts, we will make any necessary adjustments for our submission to OMB. In calculating the burden, MMS may have assumed that respondents maintain much of the information collected in the normal course of their activities, and we considered that to be usual and customary business practice.

(1) The MMS specifically solicits comments on the following questions:

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of MMS's functions, and will it be useful?

(b) Are the estimates of the burden hours of the proposed collection reasonable?

(c) Do you have any suggestions that would enhance the quality, clarity, or usefulness of the information to be collected?

(d) Is there a way to minimize the information collection burden on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology?

(2) In addition, the PRA requires agencies to estimate the total annual cost burden to respondents as a direct result of this collection of information. The MMS needs your comments on this item. Your response should split the cost estimate into two components:

(a) Total capital and startup cost component; and

(b) Annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of services component. Your estimates should consider the costs to generate, maintain, and disclose or provide the information. You should describe the methods you use to estimate major cost factors, including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, discount rate(s), and the period over which you incur costs. Capital and startup costs include, among other items, computers and software you purchase to prepare for collecting information; monitoring, sampling, drilling, and testing equipment; and record storage facilities. Do not include in your estimates equipment or services purchased: (i) before October 1, 1995; (ii) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (iii) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or (iv) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Jo Ann Lauterbach, (202) 208–7744.

Dated: August 27, 1997.

E.P. Danenberger,

Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.

[FR Doc. 97–23634 Filed 9–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Steven Cohen, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On February 25, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Steven Cohen, M.D., of Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, proposing the revocation of his DEA Certificate of Registration BC0417104, and denial of any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), for reason that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The order also advised that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, his hearing right would be deemed waived.

The Order to Show Cause was sent to Dr. Cohen by registered mail to his DEA registered address, but was returned to DEA with the notation, ''Moved, left no address''. DEA then sent the Order to Show Cause to an address provided by the State Board of Medicine. The Order was not returned to DEA, however there is no indication that it was received by Dr. Cohen and DEA did not receive any response to the Order. DEA investigators also attempted to personally deliver the Order to Show Cause to Dr. Cohen without success. DEA then learned of another possible address for Dr. Cohen in Hagerstown, Maryland. The Order sent to this address was returned to DEA indicating that the addressee had moved and left no forwarding address.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that DEA has made numerous attempts to locate Dr. Cohen and has determined that his whereabouts are unknown. It is evident that Dr. Cohen is no longer practicing medicine at the address listed on his DEA Certificate of Registration. The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that considerable effort has been made to serve Dr. Cohen with the Order to Show Cause without success. Dr. Cohen is therefore deemed to have waived his opportunity for a hearing. The Acting Deputy Administrator now enters his final order in this matter without a hearing and based on the investigative file pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 (d) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that on August 22, 1995, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of State, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, State Board of Medicine (Board) issued an Adjudication and Order revoking Dr. Cohen's license to practice medicine. The Board found that Dr. Cohen engaged in unprofessional conduct involving the provision of a medical service at a level beneath the accepted standard of care; unprofessional conduct exhibiting a reckless indifference to the interests of the patient; and unprofessional conduct involving the prescribing of a controlled substance in a way other than for an acceptable medical purpose.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that in light of the fact that Dr. Cohen is not currently licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is reasonable to infer that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in that state. The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See *Romeo J. Perez, M.D.,* 62 FR 16,193 (1997); *Demetris A. Green, M.D.,* 61 FR 60,728 (1996); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.,* 58 FR 51,104 (1993).

Here it is clear that Dr. Cohen is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Therefore, Dr. Cohen is not entitled to a DEA registration in that state.

Accordingly, the Acting 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 DEA Certificate of Registration BC0417104, previously issued to Steven Cohen, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending applications for the renewal of such registration, be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective October 6, 1997.

Dated: August 27, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–23514 Filed 9–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M