Dated: January 27, 1995.

Mollie H. Beattie,

Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 95–3510 Filed 2–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Finance Docket No. 32425]

Chicago SouthShore & South Bend Railroad—Operation Exemption—Illinois International Port District

Chicago SouthShore & South Bend Railroad (CSS) filed a notice of exemption to provide nonexclusive switching service over 8.7 miles of yard and switching track entirely within the Illinois International Port District. The track generally is located north of 130th Street and east of Doty Avenue on the west bank of Lake Calumet in Chicago, IL. The exemption was to become effective on or about October 20, 1994.

Any comments must be filed with the Commission and served on: Jo A. DeRoche, Weiner, Brodsky, Sidman & Kider, P.C., 1350 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20005–4797.

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1150.31. If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio.* Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10505(d) may be filed at any time.[1] The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

Decided: February 1, 1995.

By the Commission, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–3516 Filed 2–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035–01–P

[1] Simultaneously with the filing of the notice of exemption, CSS filed a petition to dismiss; and, on October 20, 1994, it submitted exhibits inadvertently omitted from its petition. The Railway Labor Executives' Association and United Transportation Union, respectively, filed comments on October 24 and November 3, 1994. Chicago Rail Link (CRL), on November 3, 1994, petitioned to revoke the exemption and replied to CSS's petition to dismiss. Patrick W. Simmons, Illinois Legislative Board Director, United Transportation Union (Simmons), on November 9, 1994, petitioned to reject or revoke the exemption and replied to the petition to dismiss. CSS, on November 22, 1994, withdrew its petition to dismiss the exemption and submitted a copy of a CRL letter withdrawing the latter's petition to revoke. Thereafter, on November 29, 1994, CSS replied to Simmons' petition to reject or revoke and reply to CSS's petition to dismiss. Simmons' petition was considered as an appeal in a separate decision, and that decision is being served simultaneously with this notice of exemption.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[DEA No. 129P]

Proposed 1995 Aggregate Production Quota for a Schedule II Controlled Substance

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration.

ACTION: Notice of a proposed 1995 aggregate production quota.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes a 1995 aggregate production quota for hydrocodone (for conversion), a controlled substance in Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA).

DATES: Comments or objections must be received on or before March 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments or objections to the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Attn: DEA Federal Register Representative/CCR.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard McClain, Jr., Chief, Drug & Chemical Evaluation Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Telephone: (202) 307–7183.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) (21 U.S.C. 826) requires that the Attorney General establish aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II each year. This responsibility has been delegated to the Administrator of the DEA pursuant to Section 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

The Administrator, in turn, has redelegated this function to the Deputy Administrator pursuant to 59 FR 23637 (May 6, 1994).

A company submitted an application for a manufacturing quota for hydrocodone (for conversion) a Schedule II controlled substance. Based on the review of this application and other information available to the DEA, the Deputy Administrator of the DEA, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 826), delegated to the Administrator by Section 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and redelegated to the Deputy Administrator pursuant to 59 FR 23637 (May 6, 1994), hereby proposes that the 1995 aggregate production quota for the following controlled substance, expressed in grams of anhydrous base, be established as follows:

Basic class	Proposed 1995 aggregate production quota (grams)
Hydrocodone (for conversion) ..	2,200,000

All interested persons are invited to submit comments or objections, in writing, regarding this proposal. If a person believes that one or more of these issues warrant a hearing, the individual should so state and summarize the reasons for this belief.

In the event that comments or objections to this proposal raise one or more issues which the Administrator finds warrant a hearing, the Administrator shall order a public hearing by notice in the **Federal Register**, summarizing the issues to be heard and setting the time for the hearing.

The Office of Management and Budget has determined that notices of aggregate production quotas are not subject to centralized review under Executive Order 12866.

This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in the Executive Order 12612 and it has been determined that this matter does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The Deputy Administrator hereby certifies that this action will have no significant impact upon small entities within the meaning of and intent of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C., 601, et seq. The establishment of annual aggregate production quotas for Schedules I and II controlled substances is mandated by law and by international treaty obligations. While aggregate production quotas are of primary importance to large manufacturers, their impact upon small entities is neither negative nor beneficial. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator has determined that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Dated: February 6, 1995.

Stephen H. Green,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–3456 Filed 2–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M