determines that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, Section 823(f) requires that the following factors be considered:

(1) The recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board or professional disciplinary authority.

(2) The applicant's experience in dispensing, or conducting research with respect to controlled substances.

(3) The applicant's conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of controlled substances.

(4) Compliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances.

(5) Such other conduct which may threaten the public health or safety.

These factors are to be considered in the disjunctive; the Deputy Administrator may rely on any one or a combination of factors and may give each factor the weight he deems appropriate in determining whether a registration should be revoked or an application for registration denied. See Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D., 54 FR 16422 (1989).

In this case, factors one, two, four, and five are relevant in determining whether the Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. As to factor one, ''recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board,'' the file does not contain a response from the Medical Board relevant to the Respondent's latest conduct. The file does reflect that the Medical Board reinstated the Respondent's medical license without restrictions on September 25, 1994.

However, the Deputy Administrator also finds it significant that the recent DEA investigation revealed that the Respondent actually violated the terms of the Medical Board's order in 1994. Specifically, the Respondent had agreed to obey all Federal and State laws, and he had agreed not to possess controlled substances unless such substances were prescribed for his personal use by another practitioner. Yet as early as January of 1994, the Respondent prescribed controlled substances to patients by using another physician's DEA registration number, in violation of the Controlled Substances Act. Further, the Respondent took possession of controlled substances from his patients and stored them in his desk, all in violation of the terms of his probation, which did not end until September of 1994.

As to factor two, the Respondent's ''experience in dispensing * * * controlled substances,'' and factor four, the Respondent's ''[c]ompliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances,'' the Deputy Administrator finds it significant that in 1994 and 1995, the Respondent engaged in conduct in violation of the Controlled Substances Act. Specifically, 21 U.S.C. 843 (a)(2) provides that ''[i]t shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally— * * * (2) to use in the course of * * * distribution, or dispensing of a controlled substance * * * a registration number which is * * * issued to another person.'' Here, the Respondent used the registration number of another person, Dr. S., to prescribe controlled substances to patients who were not seen or treated by Dr. S., in violation of the Controlled Substances Act. See also 21 CFR 1306.03 (''A prescription for a controlled substance may be issued only by an individual practitioner who is * * * either registered or exempted from registration * * *''). Further, when he stored controlled substances in his desk, the Respondent violated DEA regulatory provisions governing the permissible methods of storing controlled substances in order to prevent the unlawful diversion of such drugs. See 21 CFR 1301.75, Physical Security Controls for Practitioners. Thus, this unregistered Respondent's total disregard for the statutory and regulatory provisions governing the handling of controlled substances indicates that he cannot be entrusted with a DEA registration. See generally, Jude R. Hayes, M.D., 59 FR 41785 (1994).

As to factor five, ''[s]uch other conduct which may threaten the public health or safety,'' the Deputy Administrator finds it significant that the Respondent falsified patient records by adding the initials of Dr. S. to the patients' charts, when Dr. S. had neither seen nor treated the patients. Such falsification of records to conceal the Respondent's unlawful prescribing practices also serves as a basis for the Deputy Administrator's conclusion that the public interest is best served by denying the Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration.

The Deputy Administrator acknowledges that the record contains letters from the Respondent's colleagues, noting his continued sobriety and adherence to his substance abuse treatment program. Such behavior is commendable. However, the Respondent's recent acts of falsifying patients' records and prescribing controlled substances without a DEA Certificate of Registration indicate that the public interest is still better served by denying the Respondent's application for registration at this time.

Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and 28 C.F.R. 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application of Jerry Neil Rand, M.D., be, and it hereby is, denied. This order is effective July 8, 1996.

Dated: May 31, 1996.

Stephen H. Greene,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–14131 Filed 6–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

Federal Bureau of Investigation

DNA Advisory Board Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is hereby given that the DNA Advisory Board (DAB) will meet on June 20 and 21, 1996, from 9:00 am until 5:00 pm on June 20, 1996, and from 8:00 am until 1:30 pm on June 21, 1996. The meeting will be held at the Financial Center Marriott Hotel, 85 West Street, New York, NY 10006. All attendees will be admitted only after displaying personal identification which bears a photograph of the attendee.

The DAB's scope of authority is: To develop, and if appropriate, periodically revise, recommended standards for quality assurance to the Director of the FBI, including standards for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analysis of DNA; To recommend standards to the Director of the FBI which specify criteria for quality assurance and proficiency tests to be applied to the various types of DNA analysis used by forensic laboratories, including statistical and population genetics issues affecting the evaluation of the frequency of occurrence of DNA profiles calculated from pertinent population database(s); To recommend standards for acceptance of DNA profiles in the FBI's Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) which take account of relevant privacy, law enforcement and technical issues; and, To make recommendations for a system for grading proficiency testing performance to determine whether a laboratory is performing acceptably.

The topics to be discussed at this meeting include: a presentation by the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors' Laboratory Accreditation Board; review and discussion of the National Research Council's Second Report on DNA; Forensic DNA Testing

Standards; and a presentation on training and other requirements for a ''DNA Technical Manager'' in a forensic laboratory.

The meeting is open to the public on a first-come, first seated basis. Anyone wishing to address the DAB must notify the Designated Federal Employee (DFE) in writing at least twenty-four hours before the DAB meets. The notification must include the requestor's name, organizational affiliation, a short statement describing the topic to be addressed, and the amount of time requested. Oral statements to the DAB will be limited to five minutes and limited to subject matter directly related to the DAB's agenda, unless otherwise permitted by the Chairman.

Any member of the public may file a written statement for the record concerning the DAB and its work before or after the meeting. Written statements for the record will be furnished to each DAB member for their consideration and will be included in the official minutes of a DAB meeting. Written statements must be type-written on 8½″×11″ xerographic weight paper, one side only, and bound only by a paper clip (not stapled). All pages must be numbered. Statements should include the Name, Organizational Affiliation, Address, and Telephone number of the author(s). Written statements for the record will be included in minutes of the meeting immediately following the receipt of the written statement, unless the statement is received within three weeks of the meeting. Under this circumstance, the written statement will be included with the minutes of the following meeting. Written statements for the record should be submitted to the DFE.

Inquiries may be addressed to the DFE, Dr. Randall S. Murch, Chief, Scientific Analysis Section, Laboratory Division, 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20535, (202) 324–4416, FAX (202) 324–1462.

Dated: May 30, 1996.

Randall S. Murch,

Chief, Scientific Analysis Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[FR Doc. 96–14304 Filed 6–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–02–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W31,870, etc.]

American Olean Tile Company, Incorporated; Lansdale, PA, et al.; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued an Amended Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 18, 1996, applicable to all workers of American Olean Tile Company, Incorporated, located in Lansdale, Pennsylvania and operating at various locations in numerous States. The amendment was published in the Federal Register on March 26, 1996 (61 FR 13219).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The worker certification for the subject firm includes production and service center workers at various locations in the United States. Workers separated from employment at the American Olean, Lansdale, Pennsylvania location prior to the February 15, 1996, impact date are covered under TA–W–29,362. Information received from the State shows that worker separations at the additional cited U.S. locations would not be covered under the existing February 15, 1996, impact date. Accordingly, the Department is amending the worker certification to change the impact date for all of the American Olean Tile Company, Incorporated locations in the United States, except Lansdale, Pennsylvania.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–31,870 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of American Olean Tile Company, Incorporated, Lansdale, Pennsylvania (TA–W–31,870), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 15, 1996; and all workers of American Olean Tile Company, Incorporated at the various locations cited below, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 24, 1995 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974:

TA–W–31,870A Alabama
TA–W–31,870B Arizona
TA–W–31,870C California
TA–W–31,870D Connecticut
TA–W–31,870E Florida
TA–W–31,870F Georgia
TA–W–31,870G Illinois
TA–W–31,870H Indiana
TA–W–31,870I Kentucky
TA–W–31,870J Louisiana
TA–W–31,870K Maryland
TA–W–31,870L Massachusetts
TA–W–31,870M Minnesota
TA–W–31,870N Missouri
TA–W–31,870O Nevada
TA–W–31,870P New Jersey
TA–W–31,870Q New York
TA–W–31,870R Ohio
TA–W–31,870S Oklahoma
TA–W–31,870T Pennsylvania (except Lansdale)
TA–W–31,870U Tennessee
TA–W–31,870V Texas
TA–W–31,870W Utah
TA–W–31,870X Virginia
TA–W–31,870Y Washington
TA–W–31,870Z Wisconsin.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 9th day of May 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 96–14284 Filed 6–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

[TA–W–32,312]

Cambridge Industries, Inc. Heavy Truck Division, Ionia, MI; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on May 8, 1996, in response to a worker petition which was filed April 9, 1996 on behalf of workers at Cambridge Industries, Inc., Heavy Truck Division, Ionia, Michigan (TA–W–32,312).

The Department inadvertently instituted the petition as a Trade Adjustment Assistance petition, when in fact, it was a NAFTA–TAA petition. Consequently, further TAA investigation in this case would service no purpose, and the TAA investigation has been terminated. The NAFTA–TAA number assigned the case is NAFTA–00982.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of May 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 96–14285 Filed 6–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M