

encourage reclamation in a way that does not result in increased risk to human health and the environment from discarded hazardous secondary material. Several requests were received from potential commentors, to extend the comment period. EPA is hereby extending the comment period, which was set to end on September 20, 2011, to October 20, 2011.

To submit comments, or access the docket, please follow the detailed instructions as provided under **ADDRESSES**. If you have questions, consult the individuals listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: August 22, 2011.

**Suzanne Rudzinski,**

*Director, Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.*

[FR Doc. 2011-21931 Filed 8-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### 42 CFR Part 5

#### Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on Designation of Medically Underserved Populations and Health Professional Shortage Areas; Notice of Meeting

**AGENCY:** Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given of the following meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on Designation of Medically Underserved Populations and Health Professional Shortage Areas.

**DATES:** Meeting will be held on September 15, 2011, 12 p.m.–5 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Webinar format.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For more information, please contact LaCrystal McNair, Center for Healthcare Workforce Analysis, Bureau of Health Professions, Health Resources and Services Administration, Room 9-49, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857, Telephone (301) 443-3578, E-mail: [lmcnair@hrsa.gov](mailto:lmcnair@hrsa.gov). Information can also be found at the following Web site: <http://www.hrsa.gov/advisorycommittees/shortage/>.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Status:* The meeting will be open to the public.

*Purpose:* The purpose of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee on

Designation of Medically Underserved Populations and Health Professional Shortage Areas is to establish criteria and a comprehensive methodology for designation of Medically Underserved Populations (MUPs) and Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs), using a Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) process. It is hoped that use of the NR process will yield a consensus among technical experts and stakeholders on a new rule for designation of MUPs and Primary Care HPSAs, which would be published as an Interim Final Rule in accordance with Section 5602 of the Affordable Care Act, Public Law 111-148.

*Agenda:* The meeting will include a discussion of various components of a possible methodology for identifying areas of shortage and underservice, based on the recommendations of the Committee in the previous meeting. The agenda will be available on the Committee's Web site (<http://www.hrsa.gov/advisorycommittees/shortage/>) one day prior to the meeting. Agenda items are subject to change as priorities dictate.

For members of the public interested in participating in the webinar, please contact LaCrystal McNair by e-mail at [lmcnair@hrsa.gov](mailto:lmcnair@hrsa.gov). Requests to attend can be made up to two days prior to the meeting. Participants will receive an e-mail response containing the link to the webinar. Requests to provide written comments should be sent to LaCrystal McNair by e-mail at least 10 days prior to the meeting. Members of the public will have the opportunity to provide written comments before and after the meeting.

The Committee is working under tight timeframes to meet the reporting requirement in the Affordable Care Act. Due to the complexity of the issue, the Committee has been granted additional time to meet its final report deadline. As a result, meetings were added to the Committee schedule. The logistical challenges of expanding the meeting schedule hindered an earlier publication of this meeting notice.

Dated: August 22, 2011.

**Reva Harris,**

*Acting Director, Division of Policy and Information Coordination.*

[FR Doc. 2011-21883 Filed 8-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4165-15-P**

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Office of Federal Procurement Policy

#### 48 CFR Part 9904

#### Cost Accounting Standards; Allocation of Home Office Expenses to Segments

**AGENCY:** Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Cost Accounting Standards Board (Board).

**ACTION:** Notice of Discontinuation of Rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Board, is providing public notification of the decision to discontinue the rulemaking in the review of the CAS 403 thresholds at 48 CFR 9904.403-40(c)(2) that require use of the three factor formula described at 48 CFR 9904.403-50(c)(1) for allocating residual home office expenses.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Raymond J.M. Wong, Director, Cost Accounting Standards Board (telephone: 202-395-6805; e-mail: [Raymond\\_wong@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Raymond_wong@omb.eop.gov)).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **A. Regulatory Process**

Rules, Regulations and Standards issued by the Cost Accounting Standards (Board) are codified at 48 CFR chapter 99. The Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, at 41 U.S.C. 1502(c) [formerly, 41 U.S.C. 422(g)], requires the Board, prior to the establishment of any new or revised Cost Accounting Standard, to complete a prescribed rulemaking process. The process generally consists of four steps.

The CAS Board has completed step one of the statutory rulemaking process, which required the Board to consult with interested persons concerning the advantages, disadvantages, and improvements anticipated in the pricing and administration of Government contracts as a result of the adoption of a proposed Standard. This notice announces the discontinuation of the rulemaking after completing step one of the four-step process in accordance with the requirements at 41 U.S.C. 1502(c).

##### **B. Background and Summary**

The CAS Board opened a review of the CAS 403 operating revenue thresholds at the urging of interested parties, an industry group and a Federal agency. They recommended revisions to the CAS operating revenue thresholds for determining whether a contractor is

required to use the three factor formula to allocate residual home office expenses to the segments. To update the thresholds to reflect the changed economic and business environment since they were initially established, the parties took different approaches to revising the thresholds. One party advocated that the operating revenue thresholds be raised by 400 percent to reflect the changes in the consumer price index (CPI) from 1973 to 2003. The other party urged the Board to conduct a Staff Study, similar to that performed by the Board to establish the current thresholds. On February 13, 2008, the CAS Board published a Staff Discussion Paper (SDP) on the Allocation of Home Office Expenses to Segments as the first step in its review to determine whether the current CAS 403 thresholds should be revised (73 FR 8260).

### C. Public Comments

Three respondents submitted comments in response to the SDP. Two respondents supported a comprehensive study to determine the appropriate operating revenue thresholds at 48 CFR 9904.403–40(c)(2) for the application of the three factor formula described at 48 CFR 9904.403–50(c)(1), while another respondent supported adjusting the current thresholds by the change in the CPI. The arguments for the comprehensive study included the development of objective data to understand the impact of adjusting the operating revenue thresholds upon contractors subject to the three factor formula, and the possibility to measure the relationship of residual expenses to operating revenue for a representative contractor population. An impediment to conducting the comprehensive study is the time and effort required to compile and evaluate the data. In support of adjusting the current operating revenue thresholds by the change in the CPI, a respondent argued that the CPI is readily available and an independent, objective measure, while the Staff Study will require significant time and effort to accomplish without any certainty that the results would materially differ or be demonstrably superior to a CPI indexing approach. The other respondents noted that increasing the current thresholds by the change in the CPI was arbitrary and would risk exposing the acquisition community to the same underlying conditions which caused the CAS Board to promulgate CAS 403 originally.

*Response:* The CAS Board noted the arguments provided by the respondents.

### D. Conclusion

After reviewing the comments and regulatory history of CAS 403, the CAS Board believes that it would be prudent to discontinue the review of the CAS 403 three factor formula operating revenue thresholds at this time. No evidence has been presented to the Board that the current thresholds are creating an inequity, or that adjusting the thresholds would substantially change the outcome, *i.e.*, the pool of contractors required to use the three factor formula to allocate residual home office expenses to the segments would not change significantly. The Board will revisit the issue in the future if circumstances warrant doing so.

#### Daniel I. Gordon,

*Chair, Cost Accounting Standards Board.*

[FR Doc. 2011–21897 Filed 8–25–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Office of Federal Procurement Policy

#### 48 CFR Part 9904

#### Cost Accounting Standards: Accounting for Insurance Costs

**AGENCY:** Cost Accounting Standards Board (Board), Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

**ACTION:** Notice of Discontinuation of Rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Board, is providing public notification of the decision to discontinue the rulemaking on the development of an amendment to Cost Accounting Standard (CAS) 416 regarding the use of the term “catastrophic losses” at 48 CFR 9904.416–50(b)(1).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eric Shipley, Project Director, Cost Accounting Standards Board (telephone: 410–786–6381).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### A. Regulatory Process

Rules, Regulations and Standards issued by the Cost Accounting Standards Board (Board) are codified at 48 CFR chapter 99. The Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, at 41 U.S.C. 1502(c) [formerly, 41 U.S.C. 422(g)], requires the Board, prior to the establishment of any new or revised Cost Accounting Standard, to complete

a prescribed rulemaking process. The process generally consists of four steps.

The Board has already completed step one of the statutory rulemaking process, which requires the Board to consult with interested persons concerning the advantages, disadvantages, and improvements anticipated in the pricing and administration of government contracts as a result of the adoption of a proposed Standard. This notice announces the discontinuation of the rulemaking after completing step one of the four-step process in accordance with the requirements at 41 U.S.C. 1502(c).

### B. Background and Summary

#### *Prior Promulgations*

In a letter dated September 26, 2000, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics requested that the Board consider whether the word “catastrophic” in the term “catastrophic losses” should be replaced with a term such as “significant” or “very large” in 9904.416–50(b)(1) in order to (a) more closely align the Standard with what was intended by its original promulgators and (b) eliminate any confusion between 9904.416–50(b)(1) and FAR 31.205–19, Insurance cost. At its May 13, 2005 meeting, the CAS Board directed the staff to begin work on a Staff Discussion Paper (SDP). On January 26, 2006, the Board published the SDP, “Accounting for Insurance Costs” (71 FR 4335) which in particular, addressed the use of the term “catastrophic losses” in CAS 416.

#### *Public Comments*

The Board received public comments from two respondents to the SDP. One respondent was concerned whether the term “catastrophic losses” is intended to create a classification of event characterized by rare occurrence and significant loss, or whether it is only the magnitude of a given loss that is defining as “catastrophic.” This respondent believed that self-insurance should be an acceptable method to cover catastrophic losses, such as earthquakes and wind damage, as well as “other significant and non-recurring losses such as unusually large medical claims, major fires, or other losses that are significantly higher than might normally be expected.” A primary concern was that “the FAR, however, does not definitively address their allowability and CAS is unclear how costs for such significant actual self insured losses are to be measured and reflected in projected annual average losses.”