Howard Smith, M.D., 83 FR at 18,910; *Samuel Mintlow, M.D.,* 80 FR at 3652.

In terms of egregiousness, the violations that the substantial record evidence shows Respondent committed go to the heart of the CSA: Not complying with the closed regulatory system devised to ''prevent the diversion of drugs from legitimate to illicit channels'' and not prescribing controlled substances in compliance with the applicable standard of care and in the usual course of professional practice. *Gonzales* v. *Raich,* 545 U.S. at 13–14, 27.

Respondent's submissions address her acceptance of responsibility. RFAAX 10 and RFAAX 11. According to her Written Statement, she has ''always taken 100% responsibility'' for her diversion of controlled substances.'' RFAAX 10, at 1. It also states that she does ''not deny nor . . . [has she] ever in the past the unfortunate course of actions . . . [she] decided to take by diverting controlled substances.'' *Id.* at 2. Her Written Statement continues with her ''accept[ing] sole responsibility and . . . [stating that she has] taken actions to become sober and healthy and continue[s] to do such.'' *Id.*

Respondent's choice to submit a Written Statement, instead of taking advantage of her right to a hearing, means that she cannot answer questions about her acceptance of responsibility. The several areas of concern I have about her acceptance of responsibility, therefore, remain unresolved. First, Respondent's statements accepting responsibility are expressed only in the general terms of diverting controlled substances. *Id.* at 1, 2. Second, she does not accept responsibility for all of the OSC's founded allegations. Instead, she is explicit in her ''deni[al of] all the above charges against her,'' meaning, at least, the OSC charges that she was convicted of a felony relating to a controlled substance and that she materially falsified her registration renewal application. RFAAX 11, at 1. Third, she does not address, let alone accept responsibility for, the conduct the TMB found as a basis for disciplining Respondent. RFAAX 3, at 3–5 and RFAAX 11, at 11–13.

Consequently, Respondent's acceptance of responsibility is not broad enough to encompass all of the Agency's charges against her. RFAAX 3, at 3–5 and RFAAX 11, at 1, 11–13. As such, it is not unequivocal, as the Agency requires. *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.,* 84 FR 46,968, 46,972–73 (2019) (unequivocal acceptance of responsibility); *Jayam Krishna-Iyer, M.D.,* 74 FR 459, 463 (2009) (collecting cases). These deficiencies are concerning as they may mean that Respondent is not ready and/or willing to appreciate (1) the full extent of her misconduct and the (2) breadth of the harm her misconduct caused. I am also left wondering what Respondent learned from her misconduct, and whether Respondent has the resources to avoid committing the misconduct again.

For example, Respondent's statements accepting responsibility connect this acceptance with a violation of ''the oath . . . [she] took as a physician and trusted public figure.'' RFAAX 10, at 1. This, of course, is good and appropriate, and it ties into her statements that she has ''done everything in . . . [her] power to correct . . . [her] actions,'' and that ''she continue[s] to work hard at maintaining sobriety and gain[ing] the trust of those that . . . [she has] lost, including the public.'' *Id.* Her acceptance of responsibility does not appear to extend beyond the impact of her misconduct on herself, her sobriety, and the public's perception of her trustworthiness. For example, she focuses on herself as she characterizes as ''unfortunate'' Parkland Hospital's taking legal action concerning her diversion of controlled substances. RFAAX 10, at 1; *supra* section II.F. She does not mention, let alone unequivocally accept responsibility for, potentially endangering the lives of the Hospital's patients. RFAAX 3, at 3–4 and RFAAX 11, at 11–12. By way of further example, she does not acknowledge that her misconduct, not complying with the closed regulatory system devised to ''prevent the diversion of drugs from legitimate to illicit channels,'' goes to the heart of the CSA. *Gonzales* v. *Raich,* 545 U.S. at 13–14, 27. Her stated ''hard work'' goes to ''maintaining sobriety and gain[ing] the trust of those that . . . [she has] lost, including the public,'' but not, apparently, also to regaining the trust of the Agency whose statutory responsibilities include determining who may be entrusted with the responsibilities of a controlled substance registration.

For all of the above reasons, it is not reasonable for me, at this time, to trust that Respondent will comply with all controlled-substance related legal requirements in the future.[19] *Alra Labs., Inc.* v. *Drug Enf't Admin.,* 54 F.3d at 452 (''An agency rationally may conclude that past performance is the best predictor of future performance.'').

[19] I do not consider remedial measures when a Respondent does not unequivocally accept responsibility. As discussed, the scope of Respondent's presentation of remedial efforts was limited and, therefore, unpersuasive and not reassuring.

Accordingly, I shall order that Respondent's registration be revoked and that all pending applications to renew or modify Respondent's registration, and any pending application for a new registration in Texas, be denied.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. FG2374053 issued to Erica N. Grant, M.D. Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I further hereby deny any pending application of Erica N. Grant, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Erica N. Grant, M.D. for registration in Texas. This Order is effective August 27, 2021.

Anne Milgram,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2021–16003 Filed 7–27–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0277]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection and Comments Requested; Reinstatement With Change of Previously Approved Collection #1121–0277: OJJDP's National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC) Feedback Form Package

AGENCY: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice (DOJ), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until September 27, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have comments, especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Jill Molter, Web Content Manager, OJJDP's NTTAC COR at 202–514–8871, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of

Justice Programs, Department of Justice, 810 7th Street NW, Washington, DC 20530 or by email at *jill.molter@usdoj.gov.* Written comments and/or suggestions can also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officers, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to *OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 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;
— Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; 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:* Reinstatement with change of previously approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* OJJDP's NTTAC Feedback Form Package.

3. *The agency form number:* OJJDP's NTTAC, all forms included in package #1121–0277.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Individuals or households.

Other: Federal Government, State, local or tribal government; Not-for-profit institutions; Businesses or other for-profit.

Abstract: The Office for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC) Feedback Form Package is designed to collect in-person and online data necessary to continuously assess the outcomes of the assistance provided for both monitoring and accountability purposes and for continuously assessing and meeting the needs of the field. OJJDP's NTTAC will send these forms to technical assistance (TA) recipients; conference attendees; training and TA providers; online meeting participants; in-person meeting participants; and focus group participants to capture important feedback on the recipients' satisfaction with the quality, efficiency, referrals, information, and resources provided and assess the recipients' additional training and TA needs. The data will then be used to advise OJJDP's NTTAC on ways to improve the support provided to its users; the juvenile justice field at-large; and ultimately improve services and outcomes for youth.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 5066 respondents will complete forms and the response time will range from .03 hours to 1.5 hours.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* An estimated 520.5 total annual burden hours are associated with this collection.

If additional information is required, contact: Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: July 23, 2021.

Melody Braswell,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2021–16078 Filed 7–27–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2007–0003]

RIN 1218–AC98

Mechanical Power Presses Update

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), DOL.

ACTION: Request for information (RFI).

SUMMARY: OSHA requests information and comment on issues related to the mechanical power presses standard. The standard was issued in 1971 based upon the 1971 American National Standards Institute (ANSI) industry consensus standard for mechanical power presses. This ANSI standard has been updated a number of times since 1971. OSHA is seeking information regarding whether it should update the mechanical power presses standard and, if so, how closely the standard should follow the current ANSI standard for mechanical power presses. It is also seeking information on the types of presses that should be covered, the use and certification of equipment, and other topics such as presence-sensing device initiation (PSDI) systems, and requirements for press modifications, training, and injury reporting. OSHA will use the information received in response to this RFI to determine what action, if any, it may take to reduce regulatory burdens while maintaining worker safety.

DATES: Submit comments on or before October 26, 2021. All submissions must bear a postmark or provide other evidence of the submission date.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted as follows:

Electronically: You may submit comments, including attachments, electronically at *http://www.regulations.gov,* the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

OSHA will place comments and requests for a hearing, including personal information, in the public docket, which will be available online. Therefore, OSHA cautions interested parties about submitting personal information such as Social Security numbers and birthdates.

Docket: To read or download comments or other material in the docket, go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Documents in the docket are listed in the *http://www.regulations.gov* index; however, some information (*e.g.,* copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through this website. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection through the OSHA Docket Office. Contact the OSHA Docket Office for assistance in locating docket submissions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Press Inquiries: Frank Meilinger, Director, OSHA Office of Communications; telephone: 202–693–1999; email: *meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.*

General and technical information: Lisa Long, OSHA Directorate of Standards and Guidance; email: *long.lisa@dol.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: