

application for a registration be denied.” Id. See also Energy Outlet, 64 FR 14,269 (1999). In this case, I have concluded that factors one, two and five are dispositive and support the revocation of Respondent’s registration.

Factor One—Maintenance of Effective Controls

I conclude that Respondent does not maintain effective controls against diversion. Respondent’s storage of its List I chemical products in two mini-vans is clearly inadequate to protect against diversion. DEA’s regulations clearly contemplate that List 1 chemicals be stored in a secure premises and not in motor vehicles unless in transit. See 21 CFR 1309.71(b) (directing DEA to consider “[t]he location of the premises,” and “[t]he type of building construction comprising the facility and the general characteristics of the building or buildings”).

While the DIs were correct to note that the vehicles did not have alarms, even if Respondent’s vehicles had alarms, they would not comply with the regulations. A thief can steal a vehicle in far less time than it takes to break into a properly secured and alarmed premises. Moreover, a thief stealing a van holding listed chemicals does not have to load the goods into the getaway vehicle. Storage of listed chemicals in a van plainly creates an unacceptable risk of diversion.

The shortages that were found during the audit further support the conclusion that Respondent does not maintain effective controls against diversion. The shortages uncovered in the audit were substantial given that the audit only covered a period of two months. I need not find that diversion was the cause of the shortages to conclude that Respondent does not maintain effective controls against diversion.

Furthermore, Respondent’s sales records did not contain the addresses of its purchasers. Such information is essential for DEA and local authorities to effectively investigate whether purchasers are conducting a legitimate business or whether diversion is occurring. I thus conclude that factor one weighs heavily against Respondent’s continued registration.

Factor 2—Compliance With Applicable Law

As stated above, Respondent’s use of mini-vans to store List I chemicals does not comply with the physical security regulations. Moreover, Respondent failed to properly maintain sales records because its invoices did not contain product names and the addresses of the purchasers. See 21 CFR 1310.03 and

1310.06. Finally, Respondent engaged in the distribution of pseudoephedrine notwithstanding that its registration did not give it authority to distribute the chemical. See 21 CFR 1309.21(a) (requiring registration “specific to the List I chemicals to be handled”). I thus conclude that this factor weighs against Respondent’s continued registration.

Factor 3—The Registrant’s Prior Conviction Record

There is no evidence in the investigative file establishing that Respondent has been convicted of a drug-related criminal offense. I thus find that this factor weighs in favor of continued registration. I conclude, however, that this factor is entitled to little weight as it is reasonable to expect that DEA registrants not have a drug-related criminal record.

Factor 4—The Registrant’s Past Experience in Distributing List I Chemicals

The record indicates that Respondent has held a registration to distribute List I chemicals since 1998. But in light of the findings discussed above, it appears that Respondent has been improperly storing and distributing List I chemicals in violation of DEA’s regulations for a substantial period of time. I thus decline to give Respondent’s experience any weight in this determination.

Factor 5—Such Other Factors As Are Relevant to and Consistent With the Public Health and Safety

According to the investigative file, Respondent distributes List 1 chemicals solely to convenience stores and gas stations in Western Tennessee, a State which at the time these proceedings were initiated had a severe problem with methamphetamine abuse. As noted above, Tennessee recently enacted the Meth-Free Tennessee Act of 2005. See also Joy’s Ideas, 70 FR at 33199. One of the Act’s provisions requires that “any product that contains any immediate methamphetamine precursor may be dispensed only by a licensed pharmacy.” Tenn. St. § 39–17–431(a). While the Act exempts from this requirement those products containing methamphetamine precursors “not in a form that can be used in the manufacture of methamphetamine,” id. § 39–17–431(b)(1), none of the ephedrine products which Respondent distributed under his DEA registration are exempt. See id. § 39–17–431(b)(3) (exempting gel capsules and liquid preparations).

Respondent, however, does not have any licensed pharmacies as customers, and therefore, Respondent would

violate state law were it to distribute ephedrine products to its existing customers. In prior orders, I have noted the important role of the States in combating the illicit manufacture of methamphetamine. See, e.g., Joy’s Ideas, 70 FR at 33198 (discussing Oklahoma and Tennessee legislation). Where, as here, state efforts are fully consistent with federal policy, it is appropriate to give them due weight in determining whether continuing a registration would be consistent with public health and safety.¹ It would be manifestly inconsistent with public health and safety to continue Respondent’s registration in light of the provisions of Tennessee law. See id. at 33199. I therefore conclude that factor five weighs in favor of revocation. Having considered all of the statutory factors, I conclude that the continuance of Respondent’s registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

Order

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, I hereby order that DEA Certificate of Registration, 002748MMY, issued to McBride Marketing, be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective July 21, 2006.

Dated: June 12, 2006.

Michele M. Leonhart,
Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. E6–9707 Filed 6–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 30-day notice of information collection under review: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS).

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP) has submitted the following information

¹ I do not consider the relationship of Tennessee law under factor two because at the time of the investigation, the statute had not been enacted. Moreover, there is no evidence in the investigative file establishing that Respondent subsequently violated state law.

collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register**, Volume 71, Number 54, page 14252, on March 21, 2006 allowing for a 60-day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until July 21, 2006. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-5806. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this Information Collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* National Crime Victimization Survey.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:*

NCVS-110, NCVS-554, NCVS-554(SP), NCVS-572(L), NCVS-573(L), NCVS-592(L), NCVS-593(L), NCVS-592(L) SP/KOR/CHIN(T), CHIN(M), VIET.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Persons 12 years or older living in NCVS sampled households located throughout the United States. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) collects, analyzes, publishes, and disseminates statistics on the criminal victimization in the U.S.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* An estimate of the total number of respondents is 77,100. It will take the average interviewed respondent an estimated 23 minutes to respond, the average non-interviewed respondent an estimated 7 minutes to respond, the estimated average follow-up interview is 12 minutes, and the estimated average follow-up for a non-interview is 1 minute.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total respondent burden is approximately 62,620 hours.

If additional information is required, contact Robert B. Briggs, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 15, 2006.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 06-5564 Filed 6-20-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

June 15, 2006.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by contacting Ira Mills at the Department of Labor on 202-693-4122 (this is not a toll-free number) or e-mail Mills.Ira@dol.gov. This ICR can also be

accessed online at <http://www.doleta.gov/OMBCN/OMBCControlNumber.cfm>.

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for ETA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, 202-395-7316 (this is not a toll free number), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration (ETA)

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Forms for Agricultural Recruitment System of Services to Migratory Workers.

OMB Number: 1205-0134.

Frequency: On occasion.

Affected Public: State, local, or tribal government and Individuals or Households.

Type of Response: Recordkeeping.

Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Annual Responses: 5,600.

Average Response Time: ETA 790 takes 60 minutes; ETA 795 takes 15 minutes.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 4,850.

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs: 0.

Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: State Workforce Agencies and Employers use these forms to recruit domestic workers for temporary agricultural jobs in order to comply with regulations at 20 CFR 653.500.

Ira L. Mills,

Departmental Clearance Officer/Team Leader.

[FR Doc. E6-9709 Filed 6-20-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P