

off their energy bills by replacing their windows with THV windows. According to the complaint, respondent did not possess and rely upon a reasonable basis substantiating these representations when it made them. Many factors determine the savings homeowners can realize by replacing their windows, including the home's geographic location, size, insulation package, and existing windows. Consumers who replace single or double-paned wood or vinyl-framed windows—common residential window types in the United States—with THV replacement windows are not likely to achieve a 40%, 50%, or 35%–55% reduction in residential energy consumption or heating and cooling costs. The complaint also alleges that, by providing its independent dealers and installers with advertising and other promotional materials making the above unsubstantiated representations, respondent provided the means and instrumentalities to engage in deceptive practices. Thus, the complaint alleges that respondent engaged in unfair or deceptive practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

Some promotional materials challenged in the FTC's complaint include the words "up to" in an apparent attempt to qualify representations that consumers who replace windows with respondent's windows are likely to achieve specified amounts of residential energy savings or reduction in residential heating and cooling costs. In the context of specific ads in this case, the words "up to" do not effectively qualify such representations for replacement windows. The FTC's complaint and the proposed consent order should not be interpreted as a general statement of how the Commission may interpret or take other action concerning representations including the words "up to" for other products or services in the future.

The proposed consent order contains three provisions designed to prevent respondent from engaging in similar acts and practices in the future. Part I addresses the marketing of windows. It prohibits respondent from making any representation that: (A) Consumers who replace their windows with respondent's windows achieve up to or a specified amount or percentage of energy savings or reduction in heating and cooling costs; or (B) respondent guarantees or pledges that consumers who replace their windows with respondent's windows will achieve up to or a specified amount or percentage of energy savings or reduction in heating and cooling costs; unless the

representation is non-misleading and, at the time of making such representation, respondent possesses and relies upon competent and reliable scientific evidence to substantiate that all or almost all consumers are likely to receive the maximum represented savings or reduction. Further, if respondent represents, guarantees, or pledges that consumers achieve such energy savings or heating and cooling cost reductions under specified circumstances, it must: Disclose those circumstances clearly and prominently in close proximity to such representation, guarantee, or pledge; and substantiate that all or almost all consumers are likely to receive the maximum represented, guaranteed, or pledged savings or reduction under those circumstances (e.g., when replacing a window of a specific composition in a building having a specific level of insulation in a specific region). The performance standard imposed under this Part constitutes fencing-in relief reasonably necessary to ensure that any future energy savings or reduction claims are not deceptive.

Parts II and III address any product or service for which respondent makes any energy-related efficacy representation. Part II prohibits respondent from making any representation: (A) About the ability of respondent's windows to pay for themselves in energy savings alone within any specific number of years or other time period, when consumers replace their windows with respondent's windows; (B) that any specific number or percentage of consumers who replace their windows with respondent's windows achieve energy savings or reduction in heating and cooling costs; or (C) about energy consumption, energy savings, energy costs, heating and cooling costs, U-factor, solar heat gain coefficient, R-value, K-value, insulating properties, thermal performance, or energy-related efficacy; unless the representation is non-misleading and substantiated by competent and reliable scientific evidence. Part III prohibits respondent from providing to others the means and instrumentalities with which to make any false, unsubstantiated, or otherwise misleading representation of material fact. It defines "means and instrumentalities" to mean any information, including any advertising, labeling, or promotional, sales training, or purported substantiation materials, for use by trade customers in their marketing of any such product or service.

Parts IV through VIII require respondent to: Train personnel who direct or engage in the promotion or sale

of any product or service covered by the order not to make representations prohibited by the order; keep copies of advertisements and materials relied upon in disseminating any representation covered by the order; provide copies of the order to certain personnel, agents, and representatives having supervisory responsibilities with respect to the subject matter of the order; notify the Commission of changes in its structure that might affect compliance obligations under the order; and file a compliance report with the Commission and respond to other requests from FTC staff. Part IX provides that the order will terminate after twenty (20) years under certain circumstances.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the complaint or the proposed order, or to modify the proposed order's terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission, Commissioner Rosch abstaining.

**Donald S. Clark,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2012-5000 Filed 2-29-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6750-01-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Decision To Evaluate a Petition To Designate a Class of Employees From the Ventron Corporation Site in Beverly, MA, To Be Included in the Special Exposure Cohort

**AGENCY:** National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** NIOSH gives notice as required by 42 CFR 83.12(e) of a decision to evaluate a petition to designate a class of employees from the Ventron Corporation site in Beverly, Massachusetts, to be included in the Special Exposure Cohort under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. The initial proposed definition for the class being evaluated, subject to revision as warranted by the evaluation, is as follows:

*Facility:* Ventron Corporation.

*Location:* Beverly, Massachusetts.

*Job Titles and/or Job Duties:* All Atomic Weapons Employees.

*Period of Employment:* January 1, 1942 through December 31, 1948.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Stuart L. Hinnefeld, Director, Division of Compensation Analysis and Support, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 4676 Columbia Parkway, MS C-46, Cincinnati, OH 45226, Telephone 877-222-7570. Information requests can also be submitted by email to [DCAS@CDC.GOV](mailto:DCAS@CDC.GOV).

**John Howard,**

*Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.*

[FR Doc. 2012-4953 Filed 2-29-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4163-19-P**

---

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**
**Decision To Evaluate a Petition To Designate a Class of Employees From the Rocky Flats Plant in Golden, CO, To Be Included in the Special Exposure Cohort**

**AGENCY:** National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** NIOSH gives notice as required by 42 CFR 83.12(e) of a decision to evaluate a petition to designate a class of employees from the Rocky Flats Plant in Golden, Colorado, to be included in the Special Exposure Cohort under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. The initial proposed definition for the class being evaluated, subject to revision as warranted by the evaluation, is as follows:

*Facility:* Rocky Flats Plant.

*Location:* Golden, Colorado.

*Job Titles and/or Job Duties:* All employees of the Department of Energy, its predecessor agencies, and their contractors and subcontractors.

*Period of Employment:* January 1, 1972 through December 31, 1989.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Stuart L. Hinnefeld, Director, Division of Compensation Analysis and Support, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 4676 Columbia Parkway, MS C-46, Cincinnati, OH 45226, Telephone 877-222-7570. Information requests can also be submitted by email to [DCAS@CDC.GOV](mailto:DCAS@CDC.GOV).

**John Howard,**

*Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.*

[FR Doc. 2012-4961 Filed 2-29-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4163-19-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**
**Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry**

[30-Day-12-12BL]

**Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review**

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) publishes a list of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). To request a copy of these requests, call the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Reports Clearance Officer at (404) 639-7570 or send an email to [omb@cdc.gov](mailto:omb@cdc.gov). Send written comments to CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395-5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

**Proposed Project**

Biomonitoring of Great Lakes Populations Program—New—Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

*Background and Brief Description*

The Great Lakes Basin has suffered decades of pollution and ecosystem damage. In 1987, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement listed 40 Areas of Concern (AOCs) representing the most polluted areas in the Great Lakes Basin. Many chemicals persist in Great Lakes sediments, as well as in wildlife and humans. These chemicals can build up in the aquatic food chain. Eating contaminated fish is a known route of human exposure.

In 2009, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) was enacted in Public Law 111-88. The GLRI makes Great Lakes restoration a national priority for 16 federal agencies. The GLRI is led by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Under a 2010 interagency agreement with the U.S. EPA, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) announced a funding opportunity called the "Biomonitoring of Great Lakes Populations Program" (CDC-RFA-TS10-1001).

This applied public health program aims to measure Great Lakes chemicals in human blood and urine. These measures will be a baseline for the GLRI and future restoration activities. The measures will be compared to available national estimates. This program also

aims to take these measures from people who may be at higher risk of harm from chemical exposures.

Three states were funded for this program: Michigan, Minnesota, and New York. The health departments in these states will look at seven AOCs and four types of sensitive adults: Michigan—urban anglers in the Detroit River and the Saginaw River and Bay AOCs; Minnesota—American Indians near the St. Louis River AOC; and New York—licensed anglers and immigrants from Burma and their family members living in four Lake Ontario and Lake Erie AOCs. These include the Rochester Embayment AOC, the Eighteenmile Creek AOC, and the AOCs along the Niagara and Buffalo Rivers.

Each state will use its own way to ask people to take part in the study. In Michigan, people fishing along the shores of the Detroit River and Saginaw River and Bay will be asked a few questions to see if they are willing to take part in the study. In Minnesota, American Indians will be randomly chosen from a list of people who get local tribal health clinic and social services. They will be contacted by trained staff to take part in the study. In New York, names from the state licensed angler database will be chosen at random. These people will be contacted by mail and telephone to take part in the study. Another group, immigrants who moved from Burma to Buffalo, NY, will work with trained study staff to get their people to take part in the study.

All respondents who consent will give blood and urine specimens. Their blood and urine will be tested for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, lead, and pesticides. Pesticides will include mirex, hexachlorobenzene, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) and dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene (DDE). Each state will test blood and urine for other chemicals of local concern. Respondents will also be interviewed. They will be asked about demographic and lifestyle factors, hobbies, and types of jobs, which can contribute to chemical exposure. Some diet questions will be asked, too, with a focus on eating Great Lakes fish. There is no cost to respondents other than their time spent in the study. The estimated annualized burden hours are 713 hours. The ATSDR is requesting approval to conduct this information collection for two years.

The ATSDR is authorized to conduct this program under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund