decisions regarding applications currently under review or received prior to the finalization of these guidelines. Applications that have been received will be judged under the rules and laws in effect at the time they were accepted, and resultant permits issued under the appropriate guidance. However, it is not the intent of these guidelines to create new application information and review requirements, but to provide guidance concerning existing requirements to NPS management for their consideration.

*Comment:* WTF permit applicants must have reasonable access to parks to prepare complete applications.

*Response:* The NPS agrees, but reserves the right to impose such conditions as may be needed to protect the resource.

*Comment:* Right-Of-Way application information requirements must limit requests for and protect proprietary information, especially involving ''propagation maps''.

*Response:* The NPS agrees that the NPS is obligated to keep confidential certain commercial information and other types of information, which may be provided by an applicant. Our guidelines will be modified to remind park Superintendents of the FOIA rules. In addition, the 15-mile radius will be clarified as a discretionary limit.

*Comment:* The proposed provisions for Right-Of-Way termination and suspension are unreasonable to the wireless telecommunications industry.

*Response:* The proposed provisions for termination and suspension of these right-of-way permits continue to be under consideration by the Department and will be addressed when final NPS right-of-way regulations are adopted in 36 CFR Part 14.

*Comment:* The guidelines should provide an opportunity to discuss and negotiate any problems with an applicant during the application review process.

*Response:* The NPS agrees that the applicant should have the opportunity to discuss those matters that apply to the application. This would actually be the second of four such possible meetings to be described in the procedures: one prior to application; one during the initial determination period, if needed; one immediately after the acceptance of an application; and the last prior to signing of the permit, again if needed.

*Comment:* NPS should not require reviews regarding electromagnetic radiation and related communications technology issues.

*Response:* The NPS is aware of the large volume of research and investigation in place concerning electromagnetic radiation hazard and wireless technology applications. We are also aware of the radiation exposure hazard standards set out by ANSI, and the more recent FCC proposed new standards for rf exposure. Considering all this, the NPS must err on the side of caution in concern for public health and safety by mandating technological review before a WTF site can be approved.

*Comment:* The transfer of a FCC license is not a basis for termination of the ROW permit.

*Response:* The permittee agrees, in the ROW permit conditions, that the permit is not transferable without the approval of the NPS. In point of fact, this is not an isolated condition and has occurred with some regularity in other utility rights-of-way as one-company merges or buys out another. The routine procedure is to either convert the existing or issue a new ROW permit to the new company depending on circumstances. We see no reason to treat WTF ROW permits differently.

*Comment:* The procedures do not clearly require adequate or consistent compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other relevant statutes.

*Response:* The NPS accepts the comment and has revised the procedures accordingly.

*Comment:* The procedures are silent on wilderness which could infer that all designated or proposed national park system wilderness lands are excluded from the scope of the procedures.

*Response:* The NPS accepts the comment and has revised the procedures to include a statement in the Guidance section reading: ''Except as specifically provided by law or policy, there will be no permanent road, structure or installation within any study, proposed, or designated wilderness area (see Wilderness Act, 16 U.S.C. 1131). The NPS will not issue any new right-of-way permits or widen or lengthen any existing rights-of-way in designated or proposed wilderness areas. This includes the installation of utilities.''

*Comment:* Can the NPS write their procedures to include language requiring permittees to allow co-location.

*Response:* The decision whether or not to allow co-location must pass the same tests as the decision to allow a first antenna. The permit that we issue will have a condition that, if technologically feasible, we will encourage co-location.

Dated: July 29, 1998.

**Robert C. Marriott,**

*Acting Chief, Ranger Activities Division.*

[FR Doc. 98–22121 Filed 8–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.

**TIME AND DATE:** August 25, 1998 at 11:00 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC 20436.

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

1. Agenda for future meeting: none
2. Minutes
3. Ratification List
4. Inv. Nos. 701–TA–373 and 731–TA–769–775 (Final) (Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and Taiwan)—briefing and vote.
5. Outstanding action jackets:

1. Document No. EC–98–011: Response to letter concerning Inv. No. 332–325 (The Economic Effects of Significant U.S. Import Restraints)(Action Request 98–14).

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission:

Issued: August 13, 1998.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98–22301 Filed 8–14–98; 1:12 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

### Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to § 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on May 1, 1998, Applied Science Labs, Division of Alltech Associates, Inc., 2701 Carolean Industrial Drive, PO. Box 440, State College, Pennsylvania 16801, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

| Drug | Schedule |
|---|---|
| Methcathinone (1237) | I |
| N-Ethylamphetamine (1475) | I |
| N,N-Dimethylamphetamine (1480) | I |
| 4-Methylaminorex (cis isomer) (1590). | I |
| Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315) | I |
| Mescaline (7381) | I |
| 3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400). | I |
| N-Hydroxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (7402). | I |
| 3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404). | I |
| 3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (7405). | I |
| N-Ethyl-1-phenylcyclohexylamine (7455). | I |
| 1-(1-Phenylcyclohexyl)pyrrolidine (7458). | I |
| 1-[1-(2-Thienyl)cyclohexyl]piperidine (7470). | I |
| Dihydromorphine (9145) | I |
| Normorphine (9313) | I |
| Phenylcyclohexylamine (7460) | II |
| Phencyclidine (7471) | II |
| Phenylacetone (8501) | II |
| 1-Piperidinocyclohexanecarbonitrile (8603). | II |
| Cocaine (9041) | II |
| Codeine (9050) | II |
| Dihydrocodeine (9120) | II |
| Benzoylecgonine (9180) | II |
| Morphine (9300) | II |
| Oxymorphone (9652) | II |
| Noroxymorphone (9668) | II |

The firm plans to manufacture small quantities of the listed controlled substances for reference standards.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than October 19, 1998.

Dated: August 4, 1998.

**John H. King,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98–22099 Filed 8–17–98; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## Drug Enforcement Administration

### G. Wayman Blakely, Jr., M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On January 8, 1998, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to G. Wayman Blakely, Jr., M.D.[1] notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AB7704871, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and deny any pending applications for the renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that his continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. The order also notified Dr. Blakely that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, his hearing right would be deemed waived.

The DEA received a signed receipt indicating that the order was received on January 14, 1998. No request for a hearing or any other reply was recceived by the DEA from Dr. Blakely or anyone purporting to represent him in this matter. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that (1) 30 days have passed since the receipt of the Order to Show Cause, and (2) no request for a hearing haveing been received, concludes that Dr. Blakely is deemed to have waived his hearing right. After considering relevant material from the investigative file in this matter, the Acting Deputy Administrator now enters his final order without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(d) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Acting Deputy Administator finds that on July 25, 1994, Los Angeles police officers observed Dr. Blakely participating in what appeared to be a drug transaction. During a subsequent stop of his vehicle, the officers observed crack cocaine. Dr. Blakely was arrested and charged with possession of a controlled substance in violation of California Health and Safety Code, section 11350(a). On August 26, 1994, the charge against Dr. Blakely was diverted and he was placed on probation for 24 months. On or about May 29, 1996, the case against Dr. Blakely was dismissed.

The Acting Deputy Administrator further finds that between May 21, 1990 and August 25, 1994, Dr. Blakely prescribed over 11,000 dosage units of controlled substances to his friend/roommate for no legitimate medical purpose. As a result, Dr. Blakely was charged in the Municipal Court for the County of Los Angeles with 10 counts of the unlawful prescribing of a controlled substance and 5 counts of obtaining a controlled substance by fraud. On May 30, 1995, Dr. Blakely pled *nolo contendere* to three misdeameanor counts. The imposition of sentence was suspended and Dr. Blakely was placed on probation for 36 months, ordered to perform 200 hours of community service within one year, and fined $10,000.

In addition, the Acting Deputy Administrator finds that by a Decision effective February 28, 1997, the Medical Board of California adopted a Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order whereby Dr. Blakely's physician's and surgeon's certificate was revoked. However, the revocation was stayed and Dr. Blakely was placed on probation for seven years, during which time he is prohibited from handling Schedule II controlled substances, except he may prescribe dextroamphetamine and methylphenidate. As to all other controlled substances, Dr. Blakely is limited to prescribing only. He must maintain a log of his prescribing and must abstain from the personal use or possession of any controlled substance unless prescribed by another practitioner for a *bona fide* illness or condition. Additionally, Dr. Blakely must submit to biological fluid testing and must take continuing medical education courses including one in the proper prescribing of controlled substances.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4), the Deputy Administrator may revoke a DEA Certificate of Registration and deny any pending application for renewal of such registration if he determines that the registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, the following factors are 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.

[1] The Order to Show Cause was actually issued in the name of Waymon G. Blakely, M.D., however evidence before the Acting Deputy Administrator indicates that the name listed on the DEA Certificate of Registration at issue is G. Wayman Blakely, Jr., M.D. The Order to Show Cause was sent to the address listed in DEA's records for Dr. Blakely. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator is confident that notwithstanding the incorrect name on the Order to Show Cause, Dr. Blakely received proper service of the Order to Show Cause.