

has been placed in the open files in the Alaska State Office and is available to the public as a matter of information.

All inquiries relating to these lands should be sent to the Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7599; 907-267-1403.

Michael D. Wilson,

Acting Chief, Branch of Field Surveys.

[FR Doc. 02-19577 Filed 8-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-BK-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-744 (Review)]

Brake Rotors from China

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on March 1, 2002 (67 FR 9462) and determined on June 4, 2002 that it would conduct an expedited review (67 FR 40964, June 14, 2002).

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on July 29, 2002. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3528 (July 2002), entitled *Brake Rotors From China: Investigation No. 731-TA-744 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 30, 2002.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 02-19586 Filed 8-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-752 Review]

Crawfish Tail Meat From China

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of a five-year review concerning the antidumping duty order on crawfish tail meat from China.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted a review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on crawfish tail meat from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is September 20, 2002. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by October 15, 2002. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Messer (202-205-3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117-0016/USITC No. 02-5-072, expiration date June 30, 2005. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 7 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436.

ON-LINE) at <http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 15, 1997, the Department of Commerce issued an antidumping duty order on imports of crawfish tail meat from China (62 FR 48218). The Commission is conducting a review to determine whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time. It will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct a full review or an expedited review. The Commission's determination in any expedited review will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to this review:

(1) Subject Merchandise is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year review, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The Subject Country in this review is China.

(3) The Domestic Like Product is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the Subject Merchandise. In its original determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Like Product as crawfish tail meat, whether peeled or "shell-on."

(4) The Domestic Industry is the U.S. producers as a whole of the Domestic Like Product, or those producers whose collective output of the Domestic Like Product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Industry as tail meat processors.

(5) The Order Date is the date that the antidumping duty order under review became effective. In this review, the Order Date is September 15, 1997.

(6) An Importer is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the Subject Merchandise into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

Participation in the Review and Public Service List

Persons, including industrial users of the Subject Merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations,

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

wishing to participate in the review as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11(b)(4) of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the review.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are reminded that they are required, pursuant to 19 CFR 201.15, to seek Commission approval if the matter in which they are seeking to appear was pending in any manner or form during their Commission employment. The Commission's designated agency ethics official has advised that a five-year review is the "same particular matter" as the underlying original investigation for purposes of 19 CFR 201.15 and 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees. Former employees may seek informal advice from Commission ethics officials with respect to this and the related issue of whether the employee's participation was "personal and substantial." However, any informal consultation will not relieve former employees of the obligation to seek approval to appear from the Commission under its rule 201.15. For ethics advice, contact Carol McCue Verratti, Deputy Agency Ethics Official, at 202-205-3088.

Limited Disclosure of Business Proprietary Information (BPI) Under an Administrative Protective Order (APO) and APO Service List.

Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI submitted in this review available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the review, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the review. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Certification

Pursuant to section 207.3 of the Commission's rules, any person submitting information to the Commission in connection with this review must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter's knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will be deemed to consent, unless otherwise

specified, for the Commission, its employees, and contract personnel to use the information provided in any other reviews or investigations of the same or comparable products which the Commission conducts under Title VII of the Act, or in internal audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Commission pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3.

Written Submissions

Pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules, each interested party response to this notice must provide the information specified below. The deadline for filing such responses is September 20, 2002. Pursuant to section 207.62(b) of the Commission's rules, eligible parties (as specified in Commission rule 207.62(b)(1)) may also file comments concerning the adequacy of responses to the notice of institution and whether the Commission should conduct an expedited or full review. The deadline for filing such comments is October 15, 2002. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of sections 201.8 and 207.3 of the Commission's rules and any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6 and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means. Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or APO service list as appropriate), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the review you do not need to serve your response).

Inability To Provide Requested Information

Pursuant to section 207.61(c) of the Commission's rules, any interested party that cannot furnish the information requested by this notice in the requested form and manner shall notify the Commission at the earliest possible time, provide a full explanation of why it cannot provide the requested information, and indicate alternative forms in which it can provide equivalent information. If an interested party does not provide this notification (or the Commission finds the explanation provided in the notification inadequate) and fails to provide a complete response to this notice, the Commission may take an adverse inference against the party pursuant to

section 776(b) of the Act in making its determination in the review.

Information To Be Provided in Response to This Notice of Institution: As used below, the term "firm" includes any related firms.

(1) The name and address of your firm or entity (including World Wide Web address if available) and name, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the certifying official.

(2) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, a U.S. union or worker group, a U.S. importer of the Subject Merchandise, a foreign producer or exporter of the Subject Merchandise, a U.S. or foreign trade or business association, or another interested party (including an explanation). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, identify the firms in which your workers are employed or which are members of your association.

(3) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is willing to participate in this review by providing information requested by the Commission.

(4) A statement of the likely effects of the revocation of the antidumping duty order on the Domestic Industry in general and/or your firm/entity specifically. In your response, please discuss the various factors specified in section 752(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675a(a)) including the likely volume of subject imports, likely price effects of subject imports, and likely impact of imports of Subject Merchandise on the Domestic Industry.

(5) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. producers of the Domestic Like Product. Identify any known related parties and the nature of the relationship as defined in section 771(4)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677(4)(B)).

(6) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise and producers of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country that currently export or have exported Subject Merchandise to the United States or other countries since 1996.

(7) If you are a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, provide the following information on your firm's operations on that product during calendar year 2001 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of

total U.S. production of the Domestic Like Product accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) the quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s); and

(c) the quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s).

(8) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2001 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping or countervailing duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') imports;

(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping and/or countervailing duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country; and

(c) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping and/or countervailing duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country.

(9) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2001 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping or countervailing duties). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') production; and

(b) the quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of Subject Merchandise and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of Subject

Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(10) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the Domestic Like Product that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country since the Order Date, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the Domestic Like Product produced in the United States, Subject Merchandise produced in the Subject Country, and such merchandise from other countries.

(11) (OPTIONAL) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the Domestic Like Product and Domestic Industry; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: July 25, 2002.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 02-19544 Filed 8-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 00-4]

Gregory D. Owens, D.D.S.; Grant of Restricted Registration

On October 1, 1999, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Gregory D. Owens, D.D.S. (Respondent), seeking to revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner and deny any pending

applications for renewal of such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) for reason that his continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest, as defined by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4). The Respondent timely filed a request for a hearing on the allegations raised by the Order to Show Cause, and the requested hearing was held before Judge Gail A. Randall in Abingdon, Virginia, on October 4, 2000. At the hearing, each party called one witness to testify and the Government introduced documentary evidence. The Respondent offered no documentary evidence at the hearing. After the hearing, both parties submitted Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Argument. On May 4, 2001, Judge Randall issued her Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, recommending that Respondent's registration be continued subject to certain restrictions.

On May 24, 2001, the Government filed Exceptions to Judge Randall's decision, and thereafter Judge Randall transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator for final decision on June 4, 2001.

The Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, 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 Deputy Administrator adopts in full the recommended rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision of the Administrative Law Judge. His adoption is in no way diminished by any recitation of facts, issues, or conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

On October 20, 1981, the Respondent received a DEA Certificate of Registration, number AO1188881, with a registration location of Knoxville, Tennessee. The registration was renewed annually until it expired on December 31, 1985. The last renewal of that registration number was given for a location in Kingsport, Tennessee.

In 1981, the Respondent received a license to practice dentistry in the state of Virginia. Sometime in 1986, the Respondent moved from Tennessee to Virginia. The Respondent has maintained his license to practice dentistry in the Commonwealth of Virginia since the time he first received it, through the time of this hearing.

Before July 1, 1996, licensed health care professionals in Virginia needed a separate Controlled Substance Registration from the Virginia Board of