

site drainage, (3) geohazard areas, (4) areas with slopes greater than 20% and (5) areas of high visual sensitivity, except where specific design mitigation can successfully be used; ensure that applicable laws and policies of the state of Washington are followed, including health and safety regulations and Washington Growth Management Act provisions; continue willing buyer/willing seller acquisitions for properties with areas that have a high priority for resource protection, or for which public needs have been identified; emphasize opportunities for easement purchases and other less-than-fee interests for resource protection and public use.

The conclusion on impacts to the northern spotted owl in the final EIS is modified by this Record of Decision. After formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), it is the biological opinion of the FWS that the impacts from the General Management Plan for Lake Chelan NRA are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the threatened northern spotted owl. Incidental take of one pair of spotted owls or resident single owl is anticipated. The FWS concurs with the NPS determinations that the General Management Plan for Lake Chelan NRA will have "no effect" on the bald eagle and peregrine falcon and will "beneficially affect" the gray wolf, and "may affect," but will "not likely" "adversely affect," the grizzly bear.

Public Involvement

Public comment has been requested, considered and incorporated into the planning process during four major planning stages, and has also been considered in numerous other ways. Initial public scoping meetings were held in June 1991, in Stehekin, Chelan and Seattle. Public comment was again requested on the primary data set used in planning in April 1993; in a preliminary alternatives document distributed in May 1993; and in public hearings on the draft EIS in October 1994. Additionally, four newsletters were distributed during the planning process, including an extensive data summary booklet. Consultation was also completed with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Washington State Historic Preservation Office, and Native American tribes.

About 750 copies of the draft EIS were distributed. Written comments were accepted for 60 days, and over 1000 comment letters or testimonies were recorded. Responses to substantive comments on the draft EIS were published in Volume II of the final EIS,

distributed in July 1995. All substantive comments were addressed by either providing clarification of information, modifying the test, or directly responding in the final EIS.

Dated: September 7, 1995.

Rory D. Westberg,

Acting Deputy Field Director, Pacific West Area, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 95-23001 Filed 9-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Agricultural Cooperative Notice to the Commission of Intent to Perform Interstate Transportation for Certain Nonmembers

The following Notice was filed in accordance with section 10526(a)(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act. The rules provide that agricultural cooperatives intending to perform nonmember, nonexempt, interstate transportation must file the Notice, Form BOP-102, with the Commission within 30 days of its annual meeting each year. Any subsequent change concerning officers, directors, and location of transportation records shall require the filing of a supplemental Notice within 30 days of such change.

The name and address of the agricultural cooperative (1) and (2), the location of the records (3), and the name and address of the person to whom inquiries and correspondence should be addressed (4), are published here for interested persons. Submission of information which could have bearing upon the propriety of a filing should be directed to the Commission's Office of Compliance and Consumer Assistance, Washington, D.C. 20423. The Notices are in a central file, and can be examined at the Office of the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

(1) MFA Incorporated.

(2) 615 Locust Street, Columbia, MO 65201.

(3) 615 Locust Street, Columbia, MO 65201.

(4) Ann Simpson, 615 Locust Street, Columbia, MO 65201.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-23004 Filed 9-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-24]

Carmencita E. Gallosa, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On March 7, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Carmencita E. Gallosa, M.D. (Respondent), of Paintsville, Kentucky. The Order to Show Cause proposed to revoke Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration, AG9685162, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a) (3), (4) and (5) and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration under 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

Respondent, through counsel, requested a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause, and the matter was placed on the docket of Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. On April 21, 1995, the Government filed a motion for summary disposition, alleging that Respondent was not authorized to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. On May 1, 1995, Respondent responded to the Government's motion, arguing that her medical license had only been temporarily suspended by the Board, and that any action by DEA should be delayed until the Board holds an evidentiary hearing regarding Respondent's medical license.

On May 10, 1995, in her opinion and recommended decision, the administrative law judge granted the Government's motion for summary disposition and recommended that Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration be revoked and that any pending applications for registration be denied. On May 25, 1995, Respondent filed exceptions to the opinion and recommended decision of the administrative law judge. On June 12, 1994, the administrative law judge transmitted the record 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.

The administrative law judge found that the Government's motion for summary disposition alleged that Respondent is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Kentucky. The Government's motion was based on the Kentucky Board of Medical Licensure's January 19, 1995, Order of Temporary