

While in this case, there is substantial evidence that Mr. Fowler distributed pseudoephedrine with a reckless disregard for its eventual use, such proof is not essential to sustain the revocation of Respondent's registration. A proceeding under section 304 of the CSA is not a criminal prosecution. Rather, its purpose is to protect the public interest. *See Leo R. Miller*, 53 FR 21931, 21932 (1988).

“‘In determining the public interest,’ Congress granted the Attorney General broad discretion to consider any other factor that is ‘relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety.’” *T. Young*, 71 FR at 60572 (quoting 21 U.S.C. 823(h)(5)). The statutory text of factor five does not require that the Government prove that a registrant or its key employees acted with any particular *mens rea*.<sup>8</sup> As I have previously explained, “the diversion of list I chemicals into the illicit manufacture of methamphetamine poses the same threat to public health and safety whether a registrant sells the products knowing they will be diverted, sells them with a reckless disregard for the diversion, *see D & S Sales*, 71 FR at 37610–12, or sells them being totally unaware that the products were being diverted.” *T. Young*, 71 FR at 60572 (citing *Joy's Ideas*, 70 FR at 33198) (revoking registration notwithstanding that distributor was “an unknowing and unintentional contributor to [the] methamphetamine problem”). Accordingly, Respondent's excessive sales of pseudoephedrine also provide reason alone to conclude that its continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

In sum, four of the five factors conclusively demonstrate that Respondent's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest. Furthermore, in accordance with 21 CFR 1316.67, I find that Respondent's owner engaged in egregious misconduct and is responsible for the diversion of massive amounts of pseudoephedrine into the illicit manufacture of methamphetamine. There, I conclude that the public interest requires that Respondent's registration be revoked effective immediately.

#### Order

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(h) & 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b) & 0.104, I order that DEA Certificate of Registration, 003949RPY,

<sup>8</sup> To the extent *mens rea* is relevant, it is accounted for in factor three, which directs the consideration of a registrant's prior conviction record. *See* 21 U.S.C. 823(h)(3).

issued to Rick's Picks, L.L.C., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that the pending application of Rick's Picks, L.L.C., for renewal of its registration be, and it hereby is, denied. This order is effective immediately.

Dated: March 30, 2007.

**Michele M. Leonhart**,  
Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. E7-6759 Filed 4-10-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice: 07-030]

### Notice of Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection.

**SUMMARY:** The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

**DATES:** All comments should be submitted within 60 calendar days from the date of this publication.

**ADDRESSES:** All comments should be addressed to Mr. Walter Kit, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546-0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Mr. Walter Kit, NASA PRA Officer, NASA Headquarters, 300 E Street SW., JE000, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358-1350, *Walter.Kit-1@nasa.gov*.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Abstract

This is an online application form for the Exploration Systems Mission Directorate—Space Grant Consortia Faculty Project. NASA must select candidates via a competitive process, and in order to do so must collect personal information in an application. The voluntary respondents will be full-time professors that are employed at a university in the United States or Puerto Rico.

##### II. Method of Collection

This information collected on the application is needed to competitively

select faculty to participate in the 10 week Fellowship.

### III. Data

*Title:* Exploration Systems Mission Directorate—Space Grant Consortia Faculty Project.

*OMB Number:* 2700-XXXX.

*Type of review:* New Collection.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Number of Respondents:* 156.

*Responses Per Respondent:* 0.5 hour.

*Annual Responses:* 156.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 80.

### IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NASA, including whether the information collected has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of NASA's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection. They will also become a matter of public record.

**Gary Cox**,

*Deputy Chief Information Officer (Acting).*

[FR Doc. E7-6772 Filed 4-10-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-13-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 050-00315, 050-00316; License Nos. DPR-58 & DPR-74 EA-06-295]

### In the Matter of Indiana Michigan Power Company D.C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant; Confirmatory Order Modifying License (Effective Immediately)

#### I

Indiana Michigan Power Company (I&M or Licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74 issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50 on October 25, 1974 and December 23, 1977, respectively. The licenses authorize the operation of the D.C. Cook nuclear power plant units 1 & 2 in

accordance with conditions specified therein. The facility is located on the Licensee's site near Bridgeman, Michigan.

This Confirmatory Order is the result of an agreement reached during an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mediation session conducted on March 8, 2007, in Washington, DC.

## II

By letter dated December 13, 2006, the NRC identified to the Licensee an apparent violation of 10 CFR 50.7, "Employee Protection." The apparent violation was issued based on the United States Department of Labor (DOL) Administrative Review Board's (ARB's) September 29, 2006, Final Decision and Order (ARB Case No. 04-147) affirming a DOL Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) findings of fact and conclusions. On June 29, 2004, the ALJ had issued a Proposed Decision and Order (ALJ Case No. 02-ERA-30), concluding that I&M had retaliated against an I&M former test engineer in violation of Section 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended (the ERA). I&M has denied that it violated the ERA and has appealed the ARB decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Although at this time there is no indication that the impact of the apparent violation is not isolated, the NRC is concerned that, in the absence of appropriate management actions, the ARB decision may ultimately have a broader impact on the D.C. Cook plant's safety-conscious work environment (SCWE).

In its December 13, 2006, letter to I&M, the NRC offered I&M the opportunity to provide a written response, attend a predecisional enforcement conference, or request ADR in which a neutral mediator with no decision-making authority would facilitate discussions between the NRC and I&M and, if possible, assist the NRC and I&M in reaching an agreement. I&M chose to participate in ADR with the NRC. On March 8, 2007, the NRC and I&M met in Washington, DC., in an ADR session mediated by a professional mediator, arranged through Cornell University's Institute on Conflict Resolution.

## III

This Confirmatory Order is issued pursuant to the agreement reached during the March 8, 2007, mediation meeting. Specifically, I&M agreed to the following actions:

1. By no later than one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days after the issuance of this Confirmatory Order,

I&M agrees to complete an assessment of the D.C. Cook plant's Nuclear Safety Culture including its SCWE.

2. Within sixty (60) calendar days after the completion of the assessment as referenced in paragraph 1 above, I&M shall make available to the NRC:

A. A description of the tools/methods used to conduct that assessment including the survey questions;

B. The results of the assessment and I&M's analysis of the results; and

C. The proposed actions, if any, I&M would plan to take to address the results of the assessment in order to ensure that a thriving SCWE exists at the D.C. Cook plant.

3. As expeditiously as possible but by no later than December 31, 2008, I&M agrees to complete the training of all D.C. Cook plant's non-supervisory employees and long-term contractors on the topic of SCWE.

4. By no later than sixty (60) calendar days after the issuance of this Confirmatory Order, a member of I&M management at a level at least equal to the D.C. Cook plant Site Vice President will communicate with D.C. Cook plant's workforce about the company's policy and his/her expectations of management regarding the maintenance and enhancement of a SCWE.

5. By no later than ninety (90) calendar days after the issuance of this Confirmatory Order, I&M agrees to implement a periodic assessment of its compliance with its work hour limitations program and evaluate the results of the assessment for trends.

In exchange for I&M's actions set forth hereunder, the NRC agreed not to pursue any further enforcement action in connection with the NRC's December 13, 2006, letter to I&M and will not count this matter as previous enforcement for the purposes of assessing potential future enforcement action civil penalty assessments in accordance with Section VI.C of the NRC Enforcement Policy, NUREG-1600. This Confirmatory Order will, however, be considered by the NRC for any assessment of the D.C. Cook plant's performance under the NRC's Reactor Oversight Process, as appropriate. On March 30, 2007, I&M consented to the NRC issuing this Confirmatory Order. I&M further agreed that this Confirmatory Order is to be effective upon issuance and that it has waived its right to a hearing. The NRC has concluded that its concern can be resolved through issuance of this Confirmatory Order.

## IV

Since the licensee has taken several actions and implemented a number of

programs relating to communications, training and human relation initiatives addressing the D.C. Cook plant's safety culture and SCWE and has agreed to commit to the actions to address NRC's concern, as set forth in Section III above, the NRC has concluded that its concern can be resolved through issuance of this Confirmatory Order.

I find that the Licensee's actions described in Section III are acceptable and necessary and conclude that with those actions the public health and safety are reasonably assured. In view of the foregoing, I have determined that the public health and safety require that the Licensee's actions be confirmed by this Confirmatory Order. Based on the above and the Licensee's consent, this Confirmatory Order is immediately effective upon issuance.

## V

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 103, 161b, 161i, 161o, 182, and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.202 and 10 CFR Part 50, It is hereby ordered, effective immediately, that license Nos. Dpr-58 And Dpr-74 Are Modified As Follows:

1. By no later than one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days after the issuance of this Confirmatory Order, I&M agrees to complete an assessment of the D.C. Cook plant's nuclear Safety Culture including its SCWE.

2. Within sixty (60) calendar days after the completion of the assessment as referenced in paragraph I above, I&M shall make available to the NRC:

A. A description of the tools/methods used to conduct that assessment including the survey questions;

B. The results of the assessment and I&M's analysis of the results; and

C. The proposed actions, if any, I&M would plan to take to address the results of the assessment in order to ensure that a thriving SCWE exists at the D.C. Cook plant.

3. As expeditiously as possible but by no later than December 31, 2008, I&M agrees to complete the training of all D.C. Cook plant's non-supervisory employees and long-term contractors on the topic of a SCWE.

4. By no later than sixty (60) calendar days after the issuance of this Confirmatory Order, a member of I&M management at a level at least equal to the D.C. Cook plant Site Vice President will communicate with D.C. Cook plant workforce about the company's policy and his/her expectations of management regarding the maintenance and enhancement of a SCWE.

5. By no later than ninety (90) calendar days after the issuance of this

Confirmatory Order, I&M agrees to implement a periodic assessment of its compliance with its work hour limitations program and evaluate the results of the assessment for trends.

6. In the event of the transfer of the operating license of D.C. Cook plant to another entity, the actions as required by this Confirmatory Order shall continue to apply to the D.C. Cook plant and accordingly survive any transfer of ownership or license.

7. The NRC understands that I&M has appealed the ARB decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. The outcome of that appeal will not alter I&M's actions set forth herein or the provisions of this Confirmatory Order.

The Director, Office of Enforcement, may, in writing, relax or rescind any of the above conditions upon demonstration by the Licensee of good cause.

## VI

Any person adversely affected by this Confirmatory Order, other than the Licensee, may request a hearing within 20 days of its issuance. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the time to request a hearing. A request for extension of time must be made in writing to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC. 20555, and include a statement of good cause for the extension. Any request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *ATTN:* Chief, Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, Washington, DC. 20555-0001. Copies of the hearing request shall also be sent to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC. 20555-0001, to the Assistant General Counsel for Materials Litigation and Enforcement at the same address, to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region III, 2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210, Lisle, IL 60532-4352, and to the Licensee. Because of potential disruptions in delivery of mail to United States Government offices, it is requested that requests for hearing be transmitted to the Secretary of the Commission either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-1101 or by e-mail to [hearingdocket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearingdocket@nrc.gov) and also to the Office of the General Counsel either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-3725 or by e-mail to [OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov). If a person other than the licensee requests a hearing, that person shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his interest is adversely affected by this Confirmatory Order and shall address

the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 2.309(d) and (f).

If the hearing is requested by a person whose interest is adversely affected, the Commission will issue an order designating the time and place of any hearing. If a hearing is held, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Confirmatory Order should be sustained.

In the absence of any request for hearing, or written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing, the provisions specified in Section V shall be final 20 days from the date of this Confirmatory Order without further order or proceedings. If an extension of times for requesting a hearing has been approved, the provisions specified in Section V shall be final when the extension expires if a hearing request has not been received. A request for hearing shall not stay the immediate effectiveness of this order.

Dated this 4th day of April, 2007.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Cynthia A. Carpenter,**

*Director, Office of Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. E7-6843 Filed 4-10-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 040-08778]

### Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for License Amendment for Molycorp, Inc.'s Facility in Washington, PA

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Webb, Project Manager, Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Licensing Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; Telephone: (301) 415-6252; fax number: (301) 415-5398; e-mail: [jxw2@nrc.gov](mailto:jxw2@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Introduction

The NRC is considering issuance of a license amendment to Molycorp, Inc. (Molycorp or licensee) for Materials License No. SMB-1393, to authorize an alternate decommissioning schedule for its facility in Washington, Pennsylvania. NRC has prepared an Environmental

Assessment (EA) in support of this action in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. Based on the EA, the NRC has concluded that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is appropriate. The amendment will be issued following the publication of this Notice.

#### II. EA Summary

The purpose of this proposed action is to allow the licensee to decommission its facility in a phased approach which will take longer than the two year period identified in the approved decommissioning plan (DP). Following an extensive supplemental characterization study, Molycorp found that there is a large volume of contaminated material in the subsurface. Molycorp will excavate the contaminated soils and transport them off-site to an NRC approved facility. Molycorp's proposed alternate decommissioning schedule shows that all decommissioning activities will be completed by the end of 2008. Molycorp's request is contained in a letter to NRC dated October 11, 2006.

An earlier, and more extensive, EA was prepared for License Amendment No. 5, in support of the NRC staff evaluation of Molycorp's final DP. The NRC staff determined that all steps in the proposed decommissioning could be accomplished in compliance with the NRC public and occupational dose limits, effluent release limits, and residual radioactive material limits. In addition, the staff concluded that approval of the decommissioning of the Molycorp Washington, PA, facility in accordance with the commitments in NRC license SMB-1393 and the final DP would not result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. The proposed action does not change the impacts analyzed in detail in the EA prepared for License Amendment No. 5.

If the NRC approves the license amendment, the authorization will be documented in an amendment to NRC License No. SMB-1393. However, before approving the proposed amendment, the NRC will need to make the findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and NRC's regulations. These findings will be documented in a Safety Evaluation Report in addition to the EA.

#### III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The staff has prepared the EA (summarized above) in support of Molycorp's proposed alternate decommissioning schedule. The NRC staff has concluded that there will be no adverse environmental impacts associated with granting Molycorp an