

regulations. *Id.* at 474. While he attempted to shift the blame to his attorneys and consultant for failing to tell him what was required under the MOA, Respondent offered no testimony that he asked either his attorneys or consultant to explain what was required. *Id.* at 473–74. So too, while Respondent submitted the first two quarterly reports in a timely fashion, thereafter, he blew off this requirement until he was confronted by the DI.

So too, even acknowledging that the absolute amounts of the testosterone being handled by the various clinics were not especially large, it is notable that six of the clinics had recordkeeping violations including missing inventories, missing receipt records, and missing required information related to the clinics' administration of the drug. And notwithstanding his legally erroneous contention that he cannot be held to have violated the CSA's recordkeeping requirements at the non-Cy Fair clinics because he was not the registrant at those clinics, there were recordkeeping violations even at the Cy-Fair clinic, where he was registered.

Likewise, while he agreed that if his clinics engaged in administration or dispensing, the provider would be registered at the clinic, here again, Respondent breached the agreement. Particularly egregious is his failure to ensure that there was a registered provider at the Victoria clinic, where testosterone was administered at least 117 times during a three-month period when no practitioner was registered at the clinic.

I thus conclude that Respondent's misconduct was egregious (a conclusion which is buttressed by my findings with respect to Factor Five), and given his failure to offer a credible and meaningful acceptance of responsibility, I hold that he has not refuted the conclusion that his continued registration "is inconsistent with the public interest" and that both the revocation of his Florida registration and the denial of his Texas renewal application are warranted.⁴³

⁴³I have also considered Respondent's argument that "[r]evocation is too severe and [is] not required." Resp. Exceptions, at 7. Therein, Respondent maintains that "it seems clear that recordkeeping violations of the type found in this case are rarely if ever a reasons [sic] to revoke a provider's DEA registration." *Id.* He also contends "that the conduct proven in this case seems far less egregious than any of the 2015 cases including the two (*Corbett* and *Zina*), which did not result in . . . revocation." *Id.* at 7–8.

Contrary to Respondent's understanding, recordkeeping violations alone can support the revocation of a registration or the denial of an application, and in this case, there were violations of multiple requirements at nearly every one of the clinics. See *Keith Ky Ly*, 80 FR 29025, 29035 (2015)

I further agree with the CALJ that the Agency's interests in both specific and general deterrence support the revocation of his Florida registration and the denial of his Texas application. As for the Agency's interest in specific deterrence, Respondent is not barred from reapplying in the future, and were Respondent to do so and offer a credible acknowledgement of his misconduct (to go along with his remedial measures) and be granted a new registration, the sanctions I impose in this Decision and Order would hopefully deter him from engaging in future misconduct. As for the Agency's interest in general deterrence, not only does the Agency have an obvious and manifest interest in deterring violations of the CSA and regulations by members of the regulated community, the Agency also has a manifest interest in ensuring that those members to whom it extends the forbearance of an MOA will comply with the terms of those agreements.

I therefore conclude that Respondent has not refuted the Government's *prima facie* showing that his registrations are not consistent with the public interest. 21 U.S.C. 823(f), 824(a) (4). Accordingly, I will order that Respondent's Florida registration be revoked and that his application to renew his expired Texas registration be denied.

(citing *Paul H. Volkman*, 73 FR 30630, 30644 (2008)). Nor is the evidence in this matter confined to the recordkeeping violations, as it also includes his failure to file the required quarterly reports, his failure to ensure that there was a provider who was registered at the clinics which were dispensing or administering controlled substances, his use of prescriptions to obtain controlled substances for general dispensing to patients, his false statement in denying that he was subject to the MOA, his obstructionist behavior when the DI requested certain information, and his giving false testimony as to the reason why he denied to the DI that he was under the MOA.

As for Respondent's reference to the "*Corbett*" case, Respondent did not provide a citation and I am unaware of any case involving a respondent with this name. As for his reference to the "*Zina*" case, even assuming that this was typographical error and that Respondent was referring to *Abbas E. Sina*, 80 FR 53191 (2015), a self-abuse case, the case provides no comfort to Respondent because Dr. Sina fully admitted to his misconduct. *Id.* at 53201. (Dr. Sina also offered credible evidence of his rehabilitation, including four years of compliance with his monitoring contract with no failed drug tests, as well as the testimony of two physicians who attested to his commitment to his recovery and compliance with his monitoring contract. See *id.* at 53201–202). I thus reject Respondent's contention.

Finally, while Respondent also invokes *Morall v. DEA*, he ignores that, in that case, there were findings that the respondent's recordkeeping violations "occurred over a fairly short period of time" and that the respondent "appeared to regret" her misconduct. 412 F.2d at 166; see also *id.* at 183. Here, by contrast, Respondent's recordkeeping violations are not confined to a fairly short period and involve multiple clinics, and as the CALJ concluded, Respondent has not offered a credible acceptance of responsibility.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration FZ2418401 issued to Roberto Zayas, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I also order that any pending application of Roberto Zayas, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, be, and it hereby is, denied.

I further order that that the pending application of Roberto Zayas, M.D., to renew DEA Certificate of Registration FZ2249743, be, and it hereby is, denied. I further order that any other pending application of Roberto Zayas, M.D., for a DEA Certificate of Registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective June 7, 2017.

Dated: April 28, 2017.

Chuck Rosenberg,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017–09285 Filed 5–5–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Workforce Innovation Fund Grants Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, "Workforce Innovation Fund Grants Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for continued use, without change, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Public comments on the ICR are invited.

DATES: The OMB will consider all written comments that agency receives on or before June 7, 2017.

ADDRESSES: A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained free of charge from the RegInfo.gov Web site at http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref_nbr=201702-1205-004 (this link will only become active on the day following publication of this notice) or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129, TTY 202–

693–8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Submit comments about this request by mail or courier to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL–ETA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503; by Fax: 202–395–5806 (this is not a toll-free number); or by email: OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov. Commenters are encouraged, but not required, to send a courtesy copy of any comments by mail or courier to the U.S. Department of Labor–OASAM, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attn: Departmental Information Compliance Management Program, Room N1301, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; or by email: DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129, TTY 202–693–8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This ICR seeks to extend PRA authority for the Workforce Innovation Fund (WIF) Grants Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements information collection. It features quarterly performance narrative reports that document grantees' innovative strategies and effective practices and lessons learned from the diverse WIF projects. All data collection and reporting is done by grantee organizations. The performance reporting requirements align with outcome categories identified in the Solicitation for Grant Applications used to award the WIF grants. The quarterly performance narrative reports provide a detailed account of program activities, accomplishments, and progress toward performance outcomes during the quarter. Specifically, these reports include aggregate information on participants' grant progress and accomplishments, grant challenges, grant technical assistance needs and success stories and lessons learned. The performance outcomes are defined by each grantee. Each grant has a unique set of performance goals and outcome measures according to the specific innovation and project being pursued in the grant. The performance narrative reports, to be completed quarterly, include a narrative of grant activities and the unique grant performance and evaluation measures and key project milestones identified by the grantees. As a result, the specific performance

measures for each grant may be different.

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. The DOL obtains OMB approval for this information collection under Control Number 1205–0515.

OMB authorization for an ICR cannot be for more than three (3) years without renewal, and the current approval for this collection is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2017. The DOL seeks to extend PRA authorization for this information collection for three (3) more years, without any change to existing requirements. The DOL notes that existing information collection requirements submitted to the OMB receive a month-to-month extension while they undergo review. For additional substantive information about this ICR, see the related notice published in the **Federal Register** on December 23, 2016 (81 FR 94422).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the address shown in the **ADDRESSES** section within thirty (30) days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In order to help ensure appropriate consideration, comments should mention OMB Control Number 1205–0515. The OMB is particularly interested in comments that:

- 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: DOL–ETA.

Title of Collection: Workforce Innovation Fund Grants Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements.

OMB Control Number: 1205–0515.

Affected Public: State, Local, and Tribal Governments.

Total Estimated Number of Respondents: 17.

Total Estimated Number of Responses: 68.

Total Estimated Annual Time Burden: 1,360 hours.

Total Estimated Annual Other Costs Burden: \$0.

Dated: May 1, 2017.

Michel Smyth,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–09238 Filed 5–5–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

Publication Procedures for Federal Register Documents During a Funding Hiatus

AGENCY: Office of the Federal Register.

ACTION: Notice of special procedures.

SUMMARY: In the event of an appropriations lapse, the Office of the Federal Register (OFR) would be required to publish documents directly related to the performance of governmental functions necessary to address imminent threats to the safety of human life or protection of property. Since it would be impracticable for the OFR to make case-by-case determinations as to whether certain documents are directly related to activities that qualify for an exemption under the Antideficiency Act, the OFR will place responsibility on agencies submitting documents to certify that their documents relate to emergency activities authorized under the Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Bunk, Director of Legal Affairs and Policy, or Miriam Vincent, Staff Attorney, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, (202) 741–6030 or Fedreg.legal@nara.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Due to the possibility of a lapse in appropriations and in accordance with the provisions of the Antideficiency Act, as amended by Public Law 101–508, 104 Stat. 1388 (31 U.S.C. 1341), the Office of the Federal Register (OFR) announces special procedures for agencies submitting documents for publication in the **Federal Register**.