

| Activity/operator | Location | Date |
|---|---|-----------|
| Shell Offshore, Inc., Initial Exploration Plan, SEA N-9317 | DeSoto Canyon, Block 939, Lease OCS-G 31591, located 133 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline, 173 miles from the nearest Mississippi shoreline, 154 miles from the nearest Alabama shoreline and 155 miles from the nearest Florida shoreline. | 3/17/2009 |
| Energy Resource Technology GOM, Inc., Structure Removal, SEA ES/SR 09-020. | Vermilion, Block 222, Lease OCS-G 02865, located 7 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline. | 3/17/2009 |
| Energy XXI GOM, LLC, Structure Removal, SEA ES/SR 09-023. | Eugene Island, Block 256, Lease OCS-G 02102, located 53 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline. | 3/19/2009 |
| W & T Offshore, Inc., Structure Removal, SEA ES/SR 09-033 | South Marsh Island, Block 28, Lease OCS-G 09536, located 50 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline. | 3/24/2009 |
| Energy Resource Technology GOM, Inc., Permit to Modify to Remove Well 001 Using Explosive Severance Methods, SEA ES/SR APM SM123-001. | South Marsh Island, Block 123, Lease OCS-G 23845, located 31 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline. | 3/25/2009 |
| McMoran Oil & Gas, LLC, Structure Removal, SEA ES/SR 09-038. | Ship Shoal, Block 139, Lease OCS-G 21115, located 21 miles from the nearest Louisiana shoreline. | 3/31/2009 |

Persons interested in reviewing environmental documents for the proposals listed above or obtaining information about SEAs and FONSI's prepared by the Gulf of Mexico OCS Region are encouraged to contact MMS at the address or telephone listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION** section.

Dated: April 13, 2009.

Lars Herbst,

Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region.

[FR Doc. E9-10293 Filed 5-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R8-ES-2009-N0085; 1112-0000-80221-F2]

Tehachapi Uplands Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Kern County, CA

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of extension of the public comment period for the draft environmental impact statement and draft habitat conservation plan in support of an incidental take permit application.

SUMMARY: We the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), advise the public that we are extending the public comment period for the Tejon Ranchcorp's incidental take application (ITP), draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), and draft Tehachapi Uplands Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (TUMSHCP). See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for details.

DATES: Submit comments on these documents on or before July 7, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Kirkland, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, at 805-644-1766 extension 267.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: We are extending the public comment period on the ITP application, DEIS, and TUMSHCP (74 FR 6050, February 4, 2009), in response to requests from the public for a 60-day extension, in order to allow additional time for document review. This extension also will provide the public and Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies with an additional opportunity to submit information and comments on these draft documents. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

If you previously submitted comments, you need not resubmit them; we have already incorporated them into the public record and will fully consider them in finalizing these documents.

For background and more information on the applicant's proposed action, as well as how to review the ITP application, draft TUMSHCP, and draft EIS and submit comments or information, see our February 4, 2009, notice (74 FR 6050). Please refer to TE-204887-0 when requesting documents or submitting comments.

Authority

We provide this notice under section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 17.22) and the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: April 29, 2009.

Margaret Kolar,

Acting Deputy Regional Director, Pacific Southwest Nevada Region, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. E9-10286 Filed 5-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

[FBMS Charge Code L07770000.XG0000]

Field Office Relocation

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Relocation and Name Change of the Bureau of Land Management's Folsom Office in Folsom, CA.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Folsom Field Office is moving from its current location at 63 Natoma St., Folsom, CA to a new building located at 5152 Hillsdale Circle, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762. The office name will be the Mother Lode Field Office effective with the move. The BLM will move the weeks of May 4 and 11 and resume full operations at the new office on Monday, May 18, 2009, at 7 a.m.

The BLM encourages the public to arrange any work with BLM before May 1. The new telephone number is: (916) 941-3101 and is scheduled to be on line by May 18.

Directions to the new BLM office: from Highway 50 eastbound, take the Latrobe Road exit. Go 2.4 miles and turn right on Investment Boulevard. Go 0.1 miles and turn right on Robert J. Matthews Parkway. Go 0.1 mile and turn left on Hillsdale Circle. The office is on the left in 0.2 mile. The new address is: Bureau of Land Management, Mother Lode Field Office, 5152

Hillsdale Circle, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
BLM Folsom Field Office at (916) 985-4474.

Dated: April 3, 2009.

William S. Haigh,

Field Office Manager.

[FR Doc. E9-10301 Filed 5-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 07-24]

Patrick W. Stodola, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On February 7, 2007, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Patrick W. Stodola, M.D. (Respondent), of Chicago, Illinois. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration, AS2352653, as a practitioner, and proposed the denial of his pending application to renew his registration, on the ground that his "continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest." Show Cause Order at 1.

The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that while Respondent is licensed as a physician only in Illinois, he prescribed controlled substances, via the internet, to persons located in twenty-six other States. *Id.* The Order alleged that Respondent's prescribing constituted the unauthorized practice of medicine because he did not possess the licenses required to practice medicine (and prescribe) in these States, and that the prescriptions he authorized "were not issued in the usual course of professional practice as required by 21 CFR 1306.04." *Id.* at 1-2.

On March 14, 2007, Respondent filed a request for a hearing and the matter was placed on the docket of the Agency's Administrative Law Judges. Following pre-hearing procedures, a hearing was held on October 16, 2007, in Chicago, Illinois. At the hearing, both parties elicited testimony and introduced documentary evidence for the record. Following the hearing, both parties submitted briefs containing their proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument.

On September 16, 2008, the ALJ issued her recommended decision (ALJ). In evaluating Respondent's experience in dispensing controlled substances and record of compliance with applicable

laws, the ALJ concluded that Respondent had violated the medical practice standards adopted by multiple States which specifically require that a physician physically examine a patient before prescribing a drug to him/her. ALJ at 33-34. The ALJ further concluded that Respondent had violated the laws of numerous States by prescribing to their residents without holding the requisite licenses to practice medicine and/or dispense controlled substances. *Id.* at 34. While the ALJ found that Respondent has retained his Illinois medical license and has not been convicted of a crime, she further found that Respondent has "refus[ed] to acknowledge his wrongdoing." *Id.* at 32 & 34. The ALJ thus "conclude[d] that Respondent is unwilling or unable to accept the responsibilities inherent in a DEA registration," and recommended that his registration be revoked and that any pending applications be denied. *Id.* at 35.

Respondent did not file exceptions to the ALJ's decision.¹ Thereafter, the record was forwarded to me for final agency action.

Having considered the entire record in this matter, I adopt the ALJ's conclusions of law with respect to the public interest inquiry. I further adopt the ALJ's recommended sanction. Accordingly, I will revoke Respondent's registration and deny his pending application to renew the registration. I make the following findings.

Findings

Respondent is the holder of DEA Certificate of Registration, AS2352653, which authorizes him to dispensing controlled substances in schedules II through V as a practitioner. According to Respondent's Certificate of Registration, the expiration date of his registration was February 28, 2006. It is undisputed, however, that Respondent filed a timely renewal application. I therefore find that Respondent's registration has remained in effect pending the issuance of this Order. *See* 5 U.S.C. 558(c).

Respondent holds a medical license in Illinois. Tr. 85, 190-91. In his testimony, Respondent acknowledged that he is not licensed to practice medicine in any other State, *id.* at 85 & 191, and that he has never obtained a license to practice in any other State. *Id.* at 85. Moreover, Respondent does not hold a DEA registration for a location in any State other than Illinois. *Id.* at 191.

¹ While the Government filed exceptions, the exceptions do not go to the merits of the proceeding.

In early 2006, Respondent read an advertisement which had been placed by Just USA Meds² in the employment section of the Chicago Tribune's Web site. *Id.* at 165. Respondent called the phone number contained in the ad, and spoke with Challen Sullivan, Just USA's owner, who told him that his business "was to be a provider of medical services," but not "a dispenser or a vending machine of any particular medications." *Id.* at 87. Thereafter, Respondent entered into an agreement with the entity under which Just USA Meds would arrange for customers, who were seeking controlled substances, to speak with him by telephone. *Id.* at 14. Respondent was paid \$20 per consultation and would typically issue a controlled-substance prescription for the patient upon the conclusion of the consultation. *Id.* The prescriptions were then sent to pharmacies which had entered into arrangements with Just USA Meds to dispense the drugs to its customers.

According to Respondent, a customer would contact Just USA Meds, identify himself, and provide a copy of the credit card which he intended to use to pay his bill. *Id.* at 91. Respondent asserted that a customer would then be interviewed by an employee of Just USA Meds, who would ask him the name of his doctor, what other drugs he was taking, and whether he would agree not to seek drugs from another source if Respondent (or the other doctors engaged by Just USA Meds) issued a prescription for him. *Id.* at 92. Just USA would then contact the customer's credit card company to verify whether the card was valid and to request a pre-charge for the anticipated amount of the services and drugs being provided. *Id.* After Just USA obtained the pre-charge, the customer would then be scheduled for a consultation with Respondent or another physician. *Id.* at 104.

Respondent admitted that he did not physically examine any of the persons who were referred to him by Just USA Meds. Tr. 18 (testimony of DJ); *id.* at 84 (testimony of Respondent).³ Rather, Respondent asserted that the customers were required to send in medical records including the documentation of a physical exam which had to be less than one year old. *Id.* at 97-98. He also maintained that persons who claimed "some sort of structural harm" were

² In this decision, Just USA Meds will also be referred to as "Just USA."

³ Respondent did not even physically examine those persons he prescribed to who resided in the Chicago area. *See* GX 34 at 24 (resident of Chicago); GX 39 at 63 (resident of Highland Park, IL); *Id.* at 133 (resident of Arlington Heights, IL); *Id.* at 171 (resident of Hoffman Estates, IL).