

Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Mary Ruth Smith, et al.*, DOJ Ref. #90-11-3-549.

The United States filed a complaint in this matter in March 1990, pursuant to Sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607, to recover past and future response costs incurred and to be incurred by the United States with respect to the Site, and injunctive relief for the Site.

The proposed Consent Decrees may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, Western District of Kentucky, 510 West Broadway, Louisville, KY 40202; the Office of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia, 30303; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624-0892. Copies of the proposed Consent Decrees may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree with Ford Motor Company, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$190.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library for a copy of the Consent Decree with Ford Motor Company with its attachments or a check in the amount of \$17.75, for a copy of that proposed Consent Decree without its attachments. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree with the nine other parties (Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc.; The B.F. Goodrich Company; General Electric Company; Hoechst Celanese Corporation; Jim Beam Brands Company; Navistar International Transportation Corporation; Rohm and Haas Kentucky Incorporated; Safety Kleen Envirosystems Company; and Waste Management of Kentucky, LLC.), please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$9.00 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library for a copy of the Consent Decree with attachments or a check in the amount of \$8.25, for a copy of that proposed Consent Decree without its attachments.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 97-21473 Filed 8-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act; the Toxic Substances Control Act; and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Notice is hereby given that on July 28, 1997 a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, et al.*, Civ. A. No. 86-1094, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The complaint in this action seeks judgment under: Sections 106 and 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, Public Law 99-499, 42 U.S.C. 9606, 9607(a); Section 7 of the Toxic Substances Control Act ("TSCA"), 15 U.S.C. 2606; and Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), 42 U.S.C. 6973. This action involves the Paoli Railroad Yard Superfund in the City of Paoli, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

The consent decree resolves the claims of the United States against three Defendants: Consolidated Rail Corporation ("Conrail"), National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Amtrak"), and Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority ("SEPTA"). Under the terms of this decree Settling Defendants shall: (A) perform the RD/RA for all Site work on the actual rail yard portion of the Site, (B) pay \$500,000 in past costs, and, (C) pay \$850,000 for Natural Resource Damages.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the proposed consent decree for a period of thirty days from the date of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044, and should refer to *United States v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, et al.*, DOJ Reference No. 90-11-2-152. In accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d), commenters may request a public meeting in the affected areas.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 615 Chestnut St., Room 1250, Philadelphia, PA 19106; the Region III office of the Environmental

Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 "G" Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of each proposed decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library at the address listed above. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and number, and enclose a check in the amount of \$61.00 (with exhibits) (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Div.
[FR Doc. 97-21743 Filed 8-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 96-9]

Oscar I. Ordonez, M.D.; Conditional Grant of Registration

On November 8, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Oscar I. Ordonez, M.D., (Respondent) of Winchester, Indiana, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny pending applications for registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that his registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. By letter dated November 28, 1995, Respondent, through counsel, timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Indianapolis, Indiana on June 19, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, both parties submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument.

On June 17, 1997, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision, recommending that the Deputy Administrator grant Respondent's application upon Respondent's filing of a certificate or other demonstration of completion of a course of at least sixteen hours of formal training in the regulation and proper handling of controlled substances. Neither party filed exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's recommended decision, and on July 18,