

pharmacist in Oklahoma were under investigation for participating in Internet drug distribution ventures. Despite the Respondent's demonstrated awareness of the legal prohibitions surrounding his prescribing on behalf of online pharmacies, there is no evidence in the record that he ever sought guidance from the Tennessee Board or from any law enforcement entity regarding the appropriateness of such prescribing.

The Acting Deputy Administrator is deeply concerned about the increased risk of diversion which accompanies Internet controlled substance transactions. Given the nascent practice of cyber-distribution of controlled drugs to faceless individuals, where interaction between individuals is limited to information on a computer screen or credit card, it is virtually impossible to insure that these highly addictive, and sometimes dangerous products will reach the intended recipient, and if so, whether the person purchasing these products has an actual need for them. It is against this backdrop that the Acting Deputy Administrator finds factor five relevant to complaints received by the Respondent that Pill Box customers had not received drugs that he authorized, and relevant to information received by the Respondent that a Pill Box employee may have used the Respondent's name for prescriptions not authorized.

Factor five is further relevant to the Respondent's apparent role in exacerbating drug abuse and addition on the part of customers that received controlled substances through Internet consultations. As noted above, DEA received letters on behalf of individuals who became severely impaired by controlled substances authorized by the Respondent and distributed by Pill Box. The ramifications of obtaining dangerous and highly addictive drugs with the ease of logging on to a computer and the use of a credit card are disturbing and immense, particularly when one considers the growing problem of the abuse of prescription drugs in the United States.

In a 2001 report, the National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information estimated that 4 million Americans ages 12 and older had acknowledged misusing prescription drugs. That accounts for 2% to 4% of the population—a rate of abuse that has quadrupled since 1980. Prescription drug abuse—typically of painkillers, sedatives and mood-altering drugs—accounts for one-third of all illicit drug use in the United States. *Article by Melissa Healy, The Los Angeles Times, December 1, 2003.*

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that with respect to Internet transactions involving controlled substances, the horrific untold stories of drug abuse, addiction and treatment are the unintended, but foreseeable consequence of providing highly addictive drugs to the public without oversight. The closed system of distribution, brought about by the enactment of the Controlled Substances Act, is completely compromised when individuals can easily acquire controlled substances without regard to age or health status. Such lack of oversight describes Pill Box's practice of distributing controlled substances to indistinct Internet customers, and the Respondent's authorization of those drugs on behalf of the pharmacy. Therefore, the Respondent's actions in contributing to the abuse of controlled substances by customers of Pill Box is relevant under factor five and further supports the revocation of his DEA Certificate of Registration.

Factor five is further relevant to the Respondent's participation in pharmacy Internet business ventures after terminating his business relationship with Pill Box. As noted above, the Respondent demonstrated some knowledge that his prescribing on behalf of Internet pharmacies was unlawful. Nevertheless, following the termination of his business relationship with Pill Box, the Respondent actively sought to associate himself with other similar ventures, and admitted to providing consultations to Internet referral customers on behalf of online pharmacies in Florida, Oklahoma and Alabama.

It appears that the Respondent's actions in this regard were motivated purely by profit. In his selfish pursuit of financial gain, the Respondent demonstrated a cavalier disregard for controlled substance laws and regulations and a disturbing indifference to the health and safety of customers who purchased dangerous drugs through the Internet. Such demonstrated lack of character and adherence to the responsibilities inherent in a DEA registration show in no uncertain terms that the Respondent's continued registration with DEA would be inconsistent with the public interest.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in her by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration AW174166, previously issued to Mark Wade, M.D., be, and it

hereby is, revoked. This order is effective March 15, 2004.

Dated: January 20, 2004.

**Michelle M. Leonhart,**

*Acting Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 04–3127 Filed 2–11–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

## NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

### Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and of a Scoping Meeting for the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria Casino and Hotel Project, Sonoma County, CA

**AGENCY:** National Indian Gaming Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The notice advises the public that the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), in cooperation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), intends to gather information necessary for preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed casino project to be located in Sonoma County, California. The purpose of the proposed action is to help address the socio-economic needs of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. Details of the proposed action and location are provided below in the Supplemental Information section. The scoping process will include notifying the general public and federal, state, local, and tribal agencies of the proposed action. This notice also announces a public scoping meeting that will be held for the proposed action. The purpose of scoping is to identify public and agency concerns, and alternatives to be considered in the EIS.

**DATES:** Written comments on the scope of the EIS should arrive by April 1, 2004. The public hearing will be held on March 10, 2004, from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., or until the last public comment is received.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on the scope of the EIS should be addressed to: Christine Nagle, NEPA Coordinator, National Indian Gaming Commission, 1441 L Street, NW., 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20005, telephone (202) 632–7003. Please include your name, return address, and the caption: “DEIS Scoping Comments, Graton Rancheria Casino Project”, on the first page of your written comments.

The public hearing will be co-hosted by the NIGC, BIA, and the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. The

meeting location is the: Luther Burbank Center for the Arts, Ruth Finley Person Theater, 50 Mark West Spring Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95403.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general information on NEPA review procedures or status of the NEPA review, contact Christine Nagle, NIGC NEPA Coordinator, 202-632-7003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed federal action is the approval of a gaming management contract between the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and SC Sonoma Management LLC. The approval of the gaming management contract would result in the development of a resort hotel, casino, and supporting facilities. The facility will be managed by SC Sonoma Management LLC on behalf of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, pursuant to the terms of a gaming management contract. The proposed development would take place on up to 450 acres (the project site) that will be taken into trust on behalf of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. The project site is located immediately west of the City of Rohnert Park in Sonoma County, and within one mile of U.S. Highway 101. Nearby land uses include agricultural uses such as livestock grazing and dairy operations, rural residential uses, a mobile home park, industrial and commercial development, and open space. In addition to the proposed action, a reasonable range of alternatives, including a no action alternative will be analyzed in the EIS.

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria consists of approximately 999 members. It is governed by a tribal council, consisting of seven members, under a constitution that was passed by vote of the members on December 14, 2002, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior on December 23, 2002. The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria presently has no land in trust with the U.S. Government and is eligible to acquire land for reservation purposes to be placed in trust.

The NIGC will serve as lead agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The BIA will be a Cooperating Agency.

**Public Comment Solicitation:** Written comments pertaining to the proposed action will be accepted throughout the EIS planning process. However, to ensure proper consideration in preparation of the draft EIS, scoping comments should be received by April 1, 2004. The draft EIS is planned for publication and distribution in the second half of 2004.

Individual commenters may request confidentiality. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymous comments will not, however, be considered. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

**Authority:** This notice is published pursuant to Sec. 1503.1 of the Council of Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR, part 1500 through 1508 implementing the procedural requirements of the NEPA of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*)), and the NIGC NEPA Procedures Manual.

Dated: February 3, 2004.

**Philip N. Hogen,**  
*Chairman.*

[FR Doc. 04-3044 Filed 2-11-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7545-02-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-298]

### Nebraska Public Power District; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-46 issued to Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD or the licensee) for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) located in Nemaha County, NE.

The proposed amendment would revise the CNS Technical Specifications (TSs) by adding a temporary note to allow a one-time extension of a limited number of TS Surveillance Requirements (SRs). The temporary note states that the next required performance of the SR may be delayed until the current cycle refueling outage, but no later than February 2, 2005, and it expires upon startup from the refueling outage. With the exception of one SR, the period of additional time requested occurs during the next planned refueling outage.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the

Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), § 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The requested action is a one-time extension of the performance of a limited number of TS SRs. The performance of these surveillances, or the failure to perform these surveillances, is not a precursor to an accident. Performing these surveillances or failing to perform these surveillances does not affect the probability of an accident. Therefore, the proposed delay in performance of the SRs in this amendment request does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

In general a delay in performing these surveillances does not result in a system being unable to perform its required function. In the case of this one-time extension request the relatively short period of additional time that the systems and components will be in service prior to the next performance of the SRs associated with this amendment request will not impact the ability of those systems to operate. Therefore, the systems required to mitigate accidents will remain capable of performing their required function. Additionally, the more frequent TS channel functional tests and surveillances performed on the systems associated with the requested surveillance extensions provide assurance that these systems are capable of performing their functions. No new failures are introduced as a result of this action and the consequences remain consistent with previously evaluated accidents. Therefore, the proposed delay in performance of the SRs in this amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

Based on the above NPPD concludes that the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?