Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, July 11, 2008.

Robert deV. Frierson.

Deputy Secretary of the Board. [FR Doc. 08-1439 Filed 7-11-08; 3:10 pm] BILLING CODE 6210-01-S

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Notice of Proposals to Engage in Permissible Nonbanking Activities or to Acquire Companies that are **Engaged in Permissible Nonbanking Activities**

The companies listed in this notice have given notice under section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843) (BHC Act) and Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225) to engage de novo, or to acquire or control voting securities or assets of a company, including the companies listed below, that engages either directly or through a subsidiary or other company, in a nonbanking activity that is listed in § 225.28 of Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.28) or that the Board has determined by Order to be closely related to banking and permissible for bank holding companies. Unless otherwise noted, these activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Each notice is available for inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notice also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the question whether the proposal complies with the standards of section 4 of the BHC Act. Additional information on all bank holding companies may be obtained from the National Information Center website at www.ffiec.gov/nic/.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding the applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than July 30, 2008.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (Burl Thornton, Assistant Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690-1414:

1. Country Bancorporation, Crawfordsville, Iowa; to continue to engage in extending credit and servicing loans pursuant to section 225.28(b)(1) of Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, July 10, 2008.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board. [FR Doc. E8-16097 Filed 7-14-08; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6210-01-S

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Franchise Rule Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection: Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission ("Commission" or "FTC").

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The information collection requirements described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA"). The FTC is seeking public comments on its proposal to extend through October 31, 2011, the current PRA clearance for information collection requirements contained in its Trade Regulation Rule on Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising ("Franchise Rule"). That clearance expires on October 31, 2008.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 15, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments. Comments should refer to "16 CFR Part 436, Paperwork Comment, FTC File No. R511003" to facilitate the organization of comments. A comment filed in paper form should include this reference both in the text and on the envelope and should be mailed or delivered to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex J), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580. Because paper mail in the Washington area and at the FTC is subject to delay, please consider submitting your comments in electronic form, as prescribed below. If, however, the comment contains any material for which confidential treatment is requested, the comment must be filed in paper form, and the first page of the document must be clearly labeled

"Confidential."¹ Comments filed in electronic form should be submitted by following the instructions on the web-based form at: (https://secure.commentworks.com/ftcfranchiserule.) To ensure that the Commission considers an electronic comment, you must file it on the webbased form at (https:// secure.commentworks.com/ftcfranchiserule.) You may also visit http:// www.regulations.gov to read this notice, and may file an electronic comment through that website. The Commission will consider all comments that www.regulations.gov forwards to it.

The FTC Act and other laws the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. All timely and responsive public comments will be considered by the Commission and will be available to the public on the FTC website, to the extent practicable, at www.ftc.gov. As a matter of discretion, the FTC makes every effort to remove home contact information for individuals from the public comments it receives before placing those comments on the FTC website. More information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, may be found in the FTC's privacy policy at (http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/ privacy.shtm).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information requirements for the Franchise Rule should be addressed to Craig Tregillus, Staff Attorney, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-238, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326-2970.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3501-3521, federal agencies must obtain approval from OMB for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. "Collection of information" means agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. 44 U.S.C. 3502(3); 5 CFR 1320.3(c). As required by section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, the FTC is providing this opportunity for public comment before requesting that OMB extend the existing paperwork clearance for the Franchise Rule, 16 CFR Part 436 (OMB Control Number 3084-0107).

The FTC invites comments on: (1) 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; (2) 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; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including

¹ Commission Rule 4.2(d), 16 CFR 4.2(d). The comment must be accompanied by an explicit request for confidential treatment, including the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comment to be withheld from the public record. The request will be granted or denied by the Commission's General Counsel, consistent with applicable law and the public interest. See Commission Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c).

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.

The Franchise Rule ensures that consumers who are considering a franchise investment have access to the material information they need to make an informed investment decision provided in a format that facilitates comparisons of different franchise offerings. The Rule requires that franchisors disclose this information to consumers and maintain records to facilitate enforcement of the Rule. Revisions to the Rule promulgated on March 30, 2007,2 which took final effect on July 1, 2008, after a one-year phasein, largely merged the Rule's disclosure requirements with the Uniform Franchise Offering Circular ("UFOC") disclosure format accepted by 15 states that have franchise registration and disclosure laws. This should significantly minimize any compliance burden beyond what is now required by state law.

As amended, the Rule requires franchisors to furnish to prospective purchasers a disclosure document that provides information relating to the franchisor, its business, the nature of the proposed franchise, and any representations by the franchisor about financial performance regarding actual or potential sales, income, or profits made to a prospective franchise purchaser. The franchisor must preserve materially different copies of its disclosures and franchise agreements, as well as information that forms a reasonable basis for any financial performance representation it elects to make. These requirements are subject to the PRA, and for which the Commission seeks to extend existing clearance.3

Estimated annual hours burden: 16,750 hours

Based on a review of trade publications and information from state regulatory authorities, staff believes that, on average, from year to year, there are approximately 2,500 sellers of

franchises covered by the Rule, with perhaps about 10% of that total reflecting an equal amount of new and departing business entrants.4 Staff's burden hour estimate reflects the incremental burden that part 436 may impose beyond the information and recordkeeping requirements imposed by state law and/or followed by franchisors who have been using the UFOC disclosure format nationwide.5 This estimate likely overstates the actual incremental burden because some franchisors, for various reasons, may not be covered by the Rule (e.g., they sell only franchises that qualify for the Rule's large franchise investment exemption of at least \$1 million).6

For October 31, 2008 to October 31, 2009, the first twelve months of prospective 3-year renewed PRA clearance, staff estimates that the average annual disclosure burden to update existing disclosure documents will be three hours each year for the 2,250 established franchisors, or 6,750 hours (3 x 2,250), and 30 hours each year for the 250 or so new entrant franchisors to prepare their initial disclosure documents, or 7,500 hours (30×250) . These estimates for the amended Rule are based on staff's prior estimates for the original Rule, and further adopt the analysis of the 2005 clearance request and the Statement of Basis and Purpose ("SBP") for the amended Rule.7

As discussed in the 2005 Notices and the SBP, as under the original Rule, covered franchisors also may need to maintain additional documentation for the sale of franchises in non-registration states, which could take up to an additional hour of recordkeeping per year. This yields an additional cumulative total of 2,500 hours per year

for covered franchisors (1 hour x 2,500 franchisors).

Part 436 of the amended Rule would also increase franchisors' recordkeeping obligations. Specifically, a franchisor would be required to retain copies of receipts for disclosure documents, as well as materially different versions of its disclosure documents. Such recordkeeping requirements, however, are consistent with, or less burdensome, than those imposed by the states.

Thus, staff estimates the average hours burden for new and established franchisors during the three-year clearance period ahead would be 16,750 ((30 hours of annual disclosure burden x 250 new franchisors = 7,500 hours) + (3 hours of average annual disclosure burden x 2,250 established franchisors = 6,750 hours) + (1 hour of annual recordkeeping burden x 2,500 franchisors = 2,500 hours)).

Estimated annual labor cost burden for part 436: \$3,595,000

Labor costs are derived by applying appropriate hourly cost figures to the burden hours described above. The hourly rates used below are estimated averages.

As stated in the 2005 Notices, staff believes that an attorney will prepare the disclosure document, and at an estimated \$250 per hour. Accordingly, staff estimates that 250 new franchisors will each annually incur \$7,500 in labor costs (30 hours x \$250 per hour) and 2,250 established franchisors will each incur \$750, annually, in labor costs (3 hours x \$250 per hour).

Further, staff anticipates that recordkeeping under part 436 will be performed by clerical staff at approximately \$13 per hour. Thus, 2,500 hours of recordkeeping burden per year for all covered franchisors will amount to a total annual labor cost of \$32,500.

Cumulatively, then, total estimated labor costs under part 436 is \$3,595,000 ((\$7,500 attorney costs x 250 new franchisors = \$1,875,000) + (\$750 attorney costs x 2,250 established franchisors =\$1,687,500) + (\$13 clerical costs x 2,500 franchisors = \$32,500)).

Estimated non-labor costs for part 436: \$8,000,000

As an initial matter, in developing cost estimates, Commission staff consulted with practitioners who prepare disclosure documents for a cross-section of franchise systems. Accordingly, the Commission believes that its cost estimates are representative of the costs incurred by franchise systems generally. In addition, many franchisors establish and maintain

² 72 FR 15444 et seq.

³ The current clearance under OMB Control Number 3084-0107 covers the disclosure and recordkeeping requirements of the original Franchise Rule, 16 CFR Part 436, which applied both to the sale of franchises and of business opportunity ventures. The disclosure and recordkeeping requirements applicable to business opportunity ventures are now separately set forth in 16 CFR Part 437, and are covered under recently assigned OMB Control Number 3084-0142. The portion of the prior clearance applicable to business format franchisors under Part 436 retains the pre-existing OMB Control Number 3084-0107.

⁴ This is one-half of the number used in the 2005 clearance request, when both franchises and busienss opportunities were covered by the Rule, and reflects the fact that business opportunities are now separately covered by Part 437 and a separate OMB clearance. This number appears to be consistent with the number of business format franchise offerings registered in compliance with state franchise laws, and listed in franchise directories.

⁵ Staff estimates that about 95 percent of all franchisors use the UFOC format because the original Franchise Rule authorized use of the UFOC in lieu of the Rule disclosure format to satisfy the Rule's disclosure requirements in order to reduce compliance burdens.

 $^{^{6}}$ 16 CFR 436.8(a)(5). This exemption was added by the amended Rule.

 $^{^7}$ 70 FR 28937, 28940 (May 19, 2005); 70 FR 51817, 51819 (Aug. 31, 2005) ("2005 Notices"); 72 FR 15444, 15542 (Mar. 30, 2007). Although the 2005 Notices and the amended Rule's SBP assumed that additional time (cumulatively, 2,750 hours) would be required to prepare disclosures during the transition to compliance with the amended Rule, the one-year transition period ended on July 1, 2008, when the amended Rule took full effect.

websites for ordinary business purposes, including advertising their goods or services and to facilitate communication with the public. Accordingly, any costs franchisors would incur specifically as a result of electronic disclosure under part 436 appear to be minimal.

As set forth in the 2005 Notices, staff estimates that the non-labor burden incurred by franchisors under part 436 will differ based on the length of the disclosure document and the number of disclosure documents produced. Staff estimates that 2,000 franchisors (80% of total franchisors covered by the Rule) will print and mail 100 disclosure documents at \$35 each. Thus, these franchisors will each incur \$3,500 in printing and mailing costs. Staff estimates that the remaining 20% of covered franchisors (500) will transmit 50% of their 100 disclosure documents electronically, at \$5 per electronic disclosure. Thus, these franchisors will each incur \$2,000 in distribution costs ((\$250 for electronic disclosure [\$5 for electronic disclosure x 50 disclosure documents]) + (\$1,750 for printing and mailing [\$35 for printing and mailing x 50 disclosure documents])).

Accordingly, the cumulative annual non-labor costs for part 436 of the amended Rule is approximately \$8,000,000 ((\$3,500 printing and mailing costs \times 2,000 franchisors = \$7,000,000) + (\$250 electronic distribution costs + \$1,750 printing and mailing costs) \times 500 franchisors = \$1,000,000)).

William Blumenthal

General Counsel

[FR Doc. E8–16092 Filed 7–15–08: 8:45 am] [BILLING CODE 6750–01–S]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH orAdvisory Board)

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announces the following committee meeting:

Name: Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Audio Conference Call Time And Date: 11 a.m.-4 p.m., EDT, Tuesday, August 5, 2008.

Place: Audio Conference Call via FTS Conferencing. The USA toll free dial in number is 1-866-659-0537 with a pass code of 9933701.

Status: Open to the public, but without a public comment period.

Background: The Advisory Board was established under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to advise the President on a variety of policy and technical functions required to implement and effectively manage the new compensation program. Key functions of the Advisory Board include providing advice on the development of probability of causation guidelines which have been promulgated by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as a final rule, advice on methods of dose reconstruction which have also been promulgated by HHS as a final rule, advice on the scientific validity and quality of dose estimation and reconstruction efforts being performed for purposes of the compensation program, and advice on petitions to add classes of workers to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC). In December 2000, the President delegated responsibility for funding, staffing, and operating the Advisory Board to HHS, which subsequently delegated this authority to the CDC. NIOSH implements this responsibility for CDC. The charter was issued on August 3, 2001, renewed at appropriate intervals, most recently, August 3, 2007, and will expire on August 3, 2009.

Purpose: This Advisory Board is charged with (a) Providing advice to the Secretary, HHS, on the development of guidelines under Executive Order 13179; (b) providing advice to the Secretary, HHS, on the scientific validity and quality of dose reconstruction efforts performed for this program; and (c) upon request by the Secretary, HHS, advising the Secretary on whether there is a class of employees at any Department of Energy facility who were exposed to radiation but for whom it is not feasible to estimate their radiation dose, and on whether there is reasonable likelihood that such radiation doses may have endangered the health of members of this class.

Matters to be Discussed: The agenda for the conference call includes: Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status Updates; Updates from the Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction and Work Groups; Update on selection of the Board's contractor; Future Plans; and Status of transcripts and minutes.

The agenda is subject to change as priorities dictate.

Because there is not a public comment period, written comments may be submitted. Any written comments received will be included in the official record of the meeting and should be submitted to the contact person below well in advance of the meeting.

Contact Person for More Information:
Zaida Burgos, Committee Management
Specialist, NIOSH, CDC, 1600 Clifton Road,
Atlanta, Georgia 30033, Telephone (404)
498–2548 e-mail: zab6@cdc.gov.

Toll Free 1–800–CDC-INFO, e-mail ocas@cdc.gov.

The Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, has been delegated the authority to sign **Federal Register** notices pertaining to announcements of meetings and other committee management activities, for both CDC and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Dated: July 8, 2008.

Elaine L. Baker,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. E8–16065 Filed 7–14–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA-2007-P-0326]

Determination That SANOREX (Mazindol) Tablets 1 and 2 Milligrams Were Not Withdrawn From Sale for Reasons of Safety or Effectiveness

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration,

HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing its determination that SANOREX (mazindol) Tablets, 1 and 2 milligrams (mg), were not withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness. This determination will allow FDA to approve abbreviated new drug applications (ANDAs) for mazindol tablets if all other legal and regulatory requirements are met.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carol E. Drew, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 51, rm. 6306 Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 301– 796–3601.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1984,

Congress enacted the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-417) (the 1984 amendments), which authorized the approval of duplicate versions of drug products approved under an ANDA procedure. ANDA applicants must, with certain exceptions, show that the drug for which they are seeking approval contains the same active ingredient in the same strength and dosage form as the "listed drug," which is a version of the drug that was previously approved. ANDA applicants do not have to repeat the extensive clinical testing otherwise necessary to gain approval of a new drug application (NDA). The only clinical data required in an ANDA are data to show that the drug that is the subject of the ANDA is bioequivalent to the listed drug.