

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:* Revision to a currently approved collection; comments requested.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Community Policing Self-Assessment (CP-SAT)

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* None. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Law Enforcement Agencies and community partners. The purpose of this project is to improve the practice of community policing throughout the United States by supporting the development of a series of tools that will allow law enforcement agencies to gain better insight into the depth and breadth of their community policing activities.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* It is estimated that approximately 29,235 respondents will respond with an average of 17 minutes per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total estimated burden is 10,847 hours across 1,213 agencies. If additional information is required contact: Lynn Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice

Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street, NE., Room 2E-808, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: March 28, 2011.

Lynn Murray,

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

[FR Doc. 2011-7922 Filed 4-6-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

Under 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on April 1, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. Anacomp, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:10-cv-1158, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut.

The proposed Consent Decree resolves claims of the United States, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*, in connection with the Solvents Recovery Service of New England, Inc. Superfund Site ("SRS Site") in Southington, Connecticut, against the defendant, Compagnone Holdings, Inc., f/k/a Mace Adhesives, Inc. The proposed Consent Decree requires the defendant to pay \$30,463.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of 30 days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and either e-mailed to pubcommentees.enrd@usdoj.gov or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Anacomp, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:10-cv-1158, D.J. No. 90-7-1-23/10. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ConsentDecrees.html>. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S.

Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611 or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood (tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy of the proposed Consent Decree, please enclose a check in the amount of \$4.75 (25 cent per page reproduction cost), payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Ronald Gluck,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2011-8219 Filed 4-6-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 10-36]

Jacobo Dreszer, M.D., Decision and Order

On August 10, 2010, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) John J. Mulrooney, II, issued the attached recommended decision.¹ Thereafter, Respondent filed exceptions to the decision.

Having reviewed the entire record including the ALJ's recommended decision and Respondent's exceptions, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact,² conclusions of law,³ and recommended Order.

¹ All citations to the ALJ's Decision (ALJ) are to the slip opinion as issued on August 10, 2010, and not to the attached decision which has been reformatted.

² The ALJ found that there is "no evidence that the Respondent 'prescribe[d] and dispense[d] inordinate amounts of controlled substances.'" ALJ at 21. While there is no evidence as to the amounts Respondent may have dispensed directly, there is such evidence, which is unrefuted, with respect to his prescriptions. As explained in my discussion of Respondent's Exceptions, an Expert witness testified as to the usual starting doses of oxycodone and Xanax and that the prescriptions Respondent issued for both drugs, even at the initial visit, greatly exceeded the usual starting doses and lacked a legitimate medical purpose. 21 CFR 1306.04(a). Moreover, there is also unrefuted evidence that Respondent's prescribing of drug cocktails of oxycodone and Xanax lacked a legitimate medical purpose. I thus reject the ALJ's finding to the extent that it states that there was no evidence that Respondent prescribed inordinate amounts.

³ I do not, however, adopt the ALJ's discussion of the standards applied by the Agency in assessing a practitioner's experience in dispensing controlled substances, which cites cases involving list chemical I distributors, a different category of registrant. See ALJ Dec. at 20-21. As the Agency has previously made clear, DEA can revoke based on a single act of intentional diversion and "evidence that a practitioner has treated thousands of patients" in circumstances that do not constitute diversion "does not negate a *prima facie* showing that the practitioner has committed acts inconsistent with the public interest." *Jayam Krishna-Iyer*, 74 FR 459, 463 (2009). See also *Dewey C. MacKay*, 75 FR49956, 49977 (2010); *Medicine Shoppe-Jonesborough*, 73