

| Controlled substance | Drug code | Schedule |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Phenylacetone | 8501 | II |
| Coca Leaves | 9040 | II |
| Opium, raw | 9600 | II |
| Poppy Straw Concentrate | 9670 | II |

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances to bulk manufacture into Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients for distribution to its customers. Placement of these drug codes onto the company's registration does not translate into automatic approval of subsequent permit applications to import controlled substances.

In reference to drug code 7360 (Marihuana) the company plans to import a synthetic cannabidiol. No other activity for this drug code is authorized for this registration.

Dated: May 15, 2017.

Louis J. Milione,
Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017-10242 Filed 5-18-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Notice of Charter Reestablishment

In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Title 5, United States Code, Appendix, and Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations 101-6.1015, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, I have determined that the reestablishment of the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board (APB) is in the public interest. In connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the FBI by law, I hereby give notice of the reestablishment of the APB Charter.

The APB provides me with general policy recommendations with respect to the philosophy, concept, and operational principles of the various criminal justice information systems managed by the FBI's CJIS Division.

The APB includes representatives from local and state criminal justice agencies; tribal law enforcement representatives; members of the judicial, prosecutorial, and correctional sectors of the criminal justice community, as well as one individual representing a national security agency; a representative of the National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact Council; a representative of federal agencies participating in the CJIS Division Systems; and representatives of

criminal justice professional associations (*i.e.*, the American Probation and Parole Association; American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors; International Association of Chiefs of Police; National District Attorneys Association; National Sheriffs' Association; Major Cities Chiefs Association; Major County Sheriffs' Association; and a representative from a national professional association representing the courts or court administrators nominated by the Conference of Chief Justices). The Attorney General has granted me the authority to appoint all members to the APB.

The APB functions solely as an advisory body in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Charter has been filed in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Dated: May 10, 2017.

Andrew G. McCabe,
Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 2017-10095 Filed 5-18-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1110-0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comments Requested National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-day notice.

SUMMARY: Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division 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. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** allowing for a 60-day comment period.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional 30 days until June 19, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: 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 Mrs. Amy C. Blasher, Unit Chief, Federal Bureau of Investigation, CJIS Division, Module E-3, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306; facsimile (304) 625-3566. 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 Officer, 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 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 with change, of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* National Incident-Based Reporting System.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* Agency form number: 1110-0058. Sponsoring component: Department of

Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division.

Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary: City, county, state, federal, and tribal law enforcement agencies. Abstract: Under Title 28, U.S. Code, Section 534, Acquisition, Preservation, and Exchange of Identification Records; Appointment of Officials, June 11, 1930; Public Law 109–177 (H.R. 3199), March 9, 2006, USA Patriot Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005; Public Law 110–457, Title II, Section 237(a), (b), December 23, 2008, the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Reauthorization Act of 2008, and Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act, April 28, 2009, this collection requests Incident data from city, county, state, tribal and federal law enforcement agencies in order for the FBI UCR Program to serve as the national clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of crime data and to publish these statistics in Crime in the United States, Hate Crime Statistics, and Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted. NIBRS is an incident-based reporting system in which law enforcement collects data on each crime occurrence. Designed to be generated as a byproduct of local, state, and federal automated records systems, currently, the NIBRS collects data on each incident and arrest within 24 crime categories made up of 52 specific crimes called Group A offenses. For each of the offenses coming to the attention of law enforcement, various facts about the crime are collected. In addition to the Group A offenses, there are 10 Group B offense categories for which only arrest data are reported. The most significant difference between NIBRS and the traditional Summary Reporting System (SRS) is the degree of detail in reporting. In reporting data via the traditional SRS, law enforcement agencies tally the occurrences of ten Part I crimes. NIBRS is capable of producing more detailed, accurate, and meaningful data because data are collected about when and where crime takes place, what form it takes, and the characteristics of its victims and perpetrators. Although most of the general concepts for collecting, scoring, and reporting UCR data in the SRS apply in the NIBRS, such as jurisdictional rules, there are some important differences in the two systems. The most notable differences that give the NIBRS an advantage over the SRS are: No Hierarchy Rule, in a multiple-offense incident NIBRS reports every offense occurring during the

incident where SRS would report just the most serious offense and the lower-listed offense would not be reported; NIBRS provides revised, expanded, and new offense definitions; NIBRS provides more specificity in reporting offenses, using NIBRS offense and arrest data for 24 Group A offense categories can be reported while in the SRS ten Part I offenses can be reported; NIBRS can distinguish between attempted and completed Group A crimes; NIBRS also provides crimes against society while the SRS does not; the victim-to-offender data, circumstance reporting, drug related offenses, offenders suspected use of drugs, and computer crime is expanded in NIBRS; the NIBRS update reports are directly tied to the original incident submitted. The Group A offense categories include arson, assault offenses, bribery, burglary/breaking and entering, counterfeiting/forgery, destruction/damage/vandalism of property, drug/narcotic offenses, embezzlement, extortion/blackmail, fraud offenses, gambling offenses, homicide offenses, human trafficking, kidnapping/abduction, larceny/theft offenses, motor vehicle theft, pornography/obscene material, prostitution offenses, robbery, sex offenses, sex offenses/nonforcible, stolen property offenses, and weapon law violations. The Group B offense categories include bad checks, curfew/loitering/vagrancy violations, disorderly conduct, DUI, drunkenness, family offenses/nonviolent, liquor law violations, peeping tom, trespass of real property, and all other offenses. Beginning in 2019, the NIBRS will also collect additional data values to capture data on domestic violence, cargo theft, and negligent manslaughter.

(4) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* There are approximately 6,648 law enforcement agencies. The amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond is two hours monthly which totals to an annual hour burden of 24 hours. The 2 hours to respond is the time it takes for the agencies records management system (RMS) to download the NIBRS and send to the FBI. By design, law enforcement agencies generate NIBRS data as a by-product of their RMS. Therefore, a law enforcement agency builds its system to suit its own individual needs, including all of the information required for administration and operation; then forwards only the data required by the NIBRS to participate in the FBI UCR Program.

(5) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the*

collection: There are approximately 159,552 hours, annual burden, associated with this information collection. The total number of respondents is 6,648 with a total annual hour burden of 24 hours, (6,648 × 24 = 159,552 total annual hours). 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., Suite 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 16, 2017.

Melody Braswell,

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

[FR Doc. 2017–10236 Filed 5–18–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On May 15, 2017, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota in the lawsuit entitled *United States and Minnesota v. Mesabi Nugget Delaware, LLC*, Civil Action No. 0:17-cv-01606–RHK.

The United States and Minnesota filed this Complaint asserting 15 claims under the Clean Air Act against Mesabi Nugget Delaware, LLC, an iron nugget producer that owns and operates a plant located near Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. The Complaint alleges violations of various emissions limits for mercury, particulate matter, and other pollutants as set forth in Mesabi Nugget's Title V Permit. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Mesabi Nugget will pay \$150,000 as a civil penalty and agrees, prior to restarting the currently idled facility, to implement various measures to improve its monitoring and control of emissions and to comply with interim emission limits while working with the State to refine certain emission limits.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division and should refer to *United States and Minnesota v. Mesabi Nugget Delaware, LLC*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–10952. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail: