

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jay Carlson, Area Manager; or Fred Minckler, Team Leader at the address above. Telephone (208) 384-3300.

Dated: October 28, 1996.

David Vail,

*Operations Manager.*

[FR Doc. 96-28712 Filed 11-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-P

[UT-069-97-1020-00]

### Notice of Intent for Plan Amendment

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

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to amend the San Juan Resource Area Resource Management Plan. San Juan County, Utah.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to amend the San Juan Resource Management Plan (RMP) with three changes. Grazing is proposed to be retired in five side canyons of Comb Wash, a tributary of the San Juan River. The five side canyons are Road, Fish, Owl, Mule, and Arch. The second proposed change is Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) designations. The area encompassed by the following description is proposed to be changed from open to limited OHV designation.

All areas of public land from Comb Wash road (B235) on the west, to Butler Wash road (B230) on the east, and Highway 163 on the south. The northern boundary follows the old U-95 road alignment from its junction with the Comb Wash road, thence east across Comb Ridge to the Butler Wash drainage, thence south along this drainage to the township line of T. 37 S. and T. 38 S. and thence east along this line to the Butler Wash road.

The third proposed change is that a campsite in Comb Wash would no longer remain a developed site. Two Class A toilets, picnic tables, and grills would be removed. One Class C toilet would remain.

These proposed changes do not conform with the current San Juan RMP, necessitating a plan amendment. These changes are proposed in order to address a number of issues that have been raised in past scoping for the Comb Wash area:

What are the impacts of human uses, including livestock grazing, on upland and riparian vegetation?

How will riparian area functioning conditions be improved?

How will BLM manage activities to protect the watershed and meet state water quality standards?

What recreation opportunities should be provided?

How much are human uses, including livestock grazing, affecting the cultural resources in the watershed, and how can these resources be protected from further deterioration?

How will activities and resources be managed to protect, conserve and enhance wildlife populations and habitat?

There will not be any changes to planning criteria identified in the San Juan RMP as a result of this amendment.

**DATES:** The comment period for this proposed plan amendment will commence with the date of publication of this notice. Comments must be submitted on or before December 9, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kent Walter, San Juan Resource Area Manager, 435 N. Main, Monticello, Utah 84535, telephone (801) 587-2141. Existing planning documents and information are available at the above address or at the Moab District Office, 82 E. Dogwood, Moab, Utah, 84532, telephone (801) 259-6111. Comments on the proposed plan amendment should be sent to Kent Walter, San Juan Resource Area Manager, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 7, Monticello, Moab, Utah 84535, telephone (801) 587-2141.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed plan amendment includes three management actions proposed in the Comb Wash Interdisciplinary Plan. There are a number of other management actions in this plan that deal with watershed, cultural resources, recreation, wildlife, livestock, traditional use, and fire management issues. All of the other actions would be in compliance with the San Juan RMP. The Comb Wash Plan and an accompanying environmental assessment will be available for a thirty-day review immediately after the comment period for this Federal Register notice closes. The plan and environmental assessment can be obtained from the Bureau of Land Management's San Juan Resource Area office, P.O. Box 7, Monticello, Utah, 84532, telephone (801) 587-2141.

G. William Lamb,  
*State Director, Utah.*

[FR Doc. 96-28770 Filed 11-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P

[NV-930-1430-01; N-59476]

### Notice of Public Meeting on Proposed Withdrawal of Public Land; Washoe County, NV

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

**ACTION:** A public meeting/open house to discuss the proposed withdrawal of approximately 26,000 acres of public land in the Pah Rah Range within southern Washoe County, has been scheduled for December 12, 1996.

**SUMMARY:** BLM staff will be available at the Carson City District BLM Office at 1535 Hot Springs Road, Suite 300, Carson City, Nevada, to discuss and receive comments on the proposed withdrawal between 3:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. on December 12, 1996. This meeting is being held in accordance with regulations set forth in 43 CFR 2300. The withdrawal has been proposed for a period of up to 5 years to protect public land from potential impacts associated with nondiscretionary land and mineral activities while a land use plan amendment addressing future management of the public land is prepared. The lands are currently segregated from entry under the public land and mining laws. Further details can be obtained by contacting Jo Ann Hufnagle, Realty Specialist, at (702) 885-6000.

Dated this 30th day of October, 1996.

Daniel L. Jacquet,

*Acting Assistant District Manager, Carson City District.*

[FR Doc. 96-28714 Filed 11-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P

### Minerals Management Service

#### Alaska OCS Region, Beaufort Sea, Oil and Gas Lease Sale 170; Notice of Intent To Prepare Environmental Impact Statement (Comments Due in 45 Days)

#### Authority

This Notice is published pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), as amended, and the regulations issued thereunder (40 CFR Part 1501).

#### Purpose of Notice of Intent

Pursuant to the regulations (40 CFR 1501.7) implementing the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), as amended, MMS is announcing its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) regarding the oil and gas leasing proposal known as Sale 170 Beaufort Sea and the beginning of the scoping process for the EIS. Throughout the scoping process, Federal, State, and local governments and other interested parties have the opportunity to aid MMS in determining the significant issues and alternatives to be analyzed in

the EIS and the possible need for additional information.

The EIS analysis will focus on the potential environmental effects of leasing, exploration, and development of the blocks included in the Call area described in the September 30, 1996 Federal Register notice (Vol. 61, No. 190, pages 51123-5). This study (Call) area could be further defined as a result of the Area Identification procedure indicated in the September 30 notice. Alternatives to the proposal that may be considered are to cancel the sale or modify the sale.

#### Instructions on Notice of Intent

Federal, State, and local governments and other interested parties are requested to send their written comments on the scope of the EIS, significant issues that should be addressed, and alternatives that should be considered to the Regional Supervisor, Leasing and Environment, Alaska OCS Region, Minerals Management Service, 949 East 36th Avenue, room 308, Anchorage, Alaska, 99508-4302. Comments should be enclosed in an envelope labeled "Comments on the Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS on the proposed Beaufort Sea Lease Sale 170." Comments are due no later than 45 days from publication of this Notice

Dated: November 4, 1996.

Cynthia Quarterman,  
Director, Minerals Management Service.  
[FR Doc. 96-28790 Filed 11-7-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-17]

#### Stanley Alan Azen, M.D.; Grant of Restricted Registration

On January 9, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Stanley Alan Azen, M.D. (Respondent) of Sun Valley, California, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated January 31, 1995, the Respondent, through counsel, timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Long Beach,

California on November 30, 1995, before Administrative Law Judge Paul A. Tenney. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, both sides submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On February 22, 1996, Judge Tenney issued his Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Ruling, recommending that the Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration should be granted subject to his compliance with the terms of his probation with the Medical Board of California. On March 13, 1996, Government counsel filed exceptions to the Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and on March 27, 1996, Judge Tenney transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator. Subsequently, on March 29, 1996, Respondent filed exceptions to Judge Tenney's Recommended Ruling. However, Respondent's exceptions have not been considered by the Acting Deputy Administrator, since they were not filed within the time period specified in 21 CFR 1316.66, and Respondent did not request an extension of time within which to file his exceptions.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, excluding Respondent's exceptions, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended ruling of Judge Tenney, except as noted below.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent previously possessed DEA Certificate of Registration, AA8786329. On May 19, 1992, an Order to Show Cause was issued proposing to revoke that Certificate of Registration, alleging that Respondent had been convicted of a controlled substance related felony offense and that his continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. Following a hearing before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner, the then-Acting Administrator revoked Respondent's DEA registration effective March 3, 1994. See, Stanley Alan Azen, M.D., 59 FR 10,168 (1994).

In the prior proceeding, the then-Acting Administrator found that Respondent received his medical degree in 1978. Following an internship and two residencies in emergency medicine and internal medicine, Respondent worked since 1981, as an emergency

room physician. Respondent admitted that he first experimented with marijuana and cocaine in the 1970's and became a regular cocaine user during the 1980's. He further admitted that he would share cocaine with his friends, and on September 20, 1990, his girlfriend died of a cocaine overdose. During the course of the investigation into his girlfriend's death, allegations were made that Respondent sold cocaine; a cooperating individual attempted to purchase cocaine from Respondent; and a search warrant executed at Respondent's residence revealed 2 ounces of cocaine, 19 grams of marijuana, and drug paraphernalia. Respondent was arrested and on April 16, 1991, in the Municipal Court of Los Angeles, California, a four-count felony complaint was filed against Respondent charging him with the sale and possession of a controlled substance. On November 15, 1991, the Respondent pled *nolo contendere* to one felony count of simple possession of a controlled substance. In the prior proceeding, Respondent testified that as a result of his arrest he terminated his drug habits and sought treatment for his drug abuse.

In his March 3, 1994 final order, the then-Acting Administrator adopted Judge Bittner's finding that the Government had not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent sold cocaine to the cooperating individual. However, in revoking Respondent's prior DEA Certificate of Registration, the then-Acting Administrator found that Respondent had a long history of drug abuse and had not demonstrated a life-long commitment to drug rehabilitation.

On April 15, 1994, Respondent submitted an application for a new DEA registration in Schedules IV and V. That application is the subject of these proceedings. The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that the then-Acting Administrator's March 3, 1994 decision regarding Respondent is *res judicata* for purposes of this proceeding. See, Liberty Discount Drugs, Inc., 57 FR 2788 (1992) (where the findings in a previous revocation proceeding were held to be *res judicata* in a subsequent administrative proceeding.) The then-Acting Administrator's determination of the facts relating to the previous revocation of the Respondent's DEA registration is conclusive. Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator adopts the March 3, 1994 final order in its entirety. The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that the critical issue in this proceeding is whether the circumstances, which existed at the time of the prior