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Number of Respondents and Responses: 50 respondents; 50 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 20 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this collection is Section 154(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Total Annual Burden: 17 hours.

Total Annual Cost: $63,750.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality with this collection of information.

Needs and Uses: 47 CFR 73.3588 states whenever a petition to deny or an informal objection has been filed against any applications for renewal, new construction permits, modifications, and transfers/assignments, and the filing party seeks to dismiss or withdraw the petition to deny or the informal objection, either unilaterally or in exchange for financial consideration, that party must file with the Commission a request for approval of the dismissal or withdrawal. This request must include the following documents: (1) A copy of any written agreement related to the dismissal or withdrawal, (2) an affidavit stating that the petitioner has not received any consideration in excess of legitimate and prudent expenses in exchange for dismissing/withdrawing its petition, (3) an itemization of the expenses for which it is seeking reimbursement, and (4) the terms of any oral agreements related to the dismissal or withdrawal of the petitions to deny. Each remaining party to any written or oral agreement must submit an affidavit within 5 days of petitioner’s request for approval stating that it has paid no consideration to the petitioner in excess of the petitioner’s legitimate and prudent expenses. The affidavit must also include the terms of any oral agreements relating to the dismissal or withdrawal of the petition to deny.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0626.

Title: Section 90.483, Permissible Methods and Requirements of Interconnecting Private and Public Systems of Communications.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business of other for-profit entities.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 100 respondents; 100 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 1 hour.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirements; Third party disclosure requirement.

Obligation To Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this collection of information is contained in Sections 4(i), 11, 303(g), 303(r), and 332(c)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 161, 303(g), 303(r), 332(c)(7).

Total Annual Burden: 100 hours.

Annual Cost Burden: None.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality with this collection.

Needs and Uses: When a frequency is shared by more than one system, automatic monitoring equipment must be installed at the base station to prevent activation of the transmitter when signals of co-channel stations are present and activation would interfere with communications in progress. Licensees may operate without the monitoring equipment if they have obtained the consent of all co-channel licensees located within a 120 kilometer (75 mile) radius of the interconnected base station transmitter. A statement must be submitted to the Commission indicating that all co-channel licensees have consented to operate without the monitoring equipment. This information is necessary to ensure that licensees comply with the Commission’s technical and operational rules, and to prevent activation of the transmitter when signals of co-channel stations are present and could possibly interfere with communications in process.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,
Secretary, Office of Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–22299 Filed 9–13–16; 4:15 pm]
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A Performance Test Protocol for Closed System Transfer Devices Used During Pharmacy Compounding and Administration of Hazardous Drugs

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

ACTION: Notice of public meeting and request for public comment on a draft testing protocol.

SUMMARY: The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announces a public meeting concerning a universal closed system drug-transfer device (CSTD) testing protocol entitled, A Performance Test Protocol for Closed System Transfer Devices Used During Pharmacy Compounding and Administration of Hazardous Drugs, http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hazdrug/default.html/.

This is an opportunity for public comment on the protocol, the proposed list of surrogates, and to respond to NIOSH questions regarding the protocol. To view the protocol and related materials, visit www.regulations.gov and enter CDC–2016–0090 in the search field and click “Search.”
I. Background:
Closed system drug-transfer devices (CSTDs) are generally available in two design types: (1) One that uses a physical barrier to block the unintended release of drug into the surrounding environment or the intake of environmental contaminants into the sterile drug pathway and (2) one that uses air cleaning or filtration technologies to prevent the unintended release of drug into the surrounding environment or the intake of environmental contaminants into the sterile drug pathway. On September 8, 2015, NIOSH released the draft test protocol, A Vapor Containment Performance Protocol for Closed System Transfer Devices Used During Pharmacy Compounding and Administration of Hazardous Drugs, for public review. The draft protocol was developed by NIOSH to evaluate how containment effective the physical barrier-type CSTDs were as an indicator of how protective they would be at preventing hazardous drug escape from the closed system. After significant public comment and several inquiries, on January 19, 2016, NIOSH published a Request for Information for the development of a test protocol to evaluate the performance of CSTDs that adopt air-cleaning or filtration technologies. Since the Federal Register docket for both the draft protocol and the request for information closed on March 8, 2016, NIOSH has done the following:

a. Generated a list of surrogates to test both types of CSTDs.

b. Met individually with CSTD manufacturers who requested informal meetings to discuss the current draft protocol and/or items NIOSH should consider in developing a new performance test protocol for air-cleaning CSTDs. This was in answer to NIOSH’s Request for Information question #12. Are you interested in being a collaborative partner with NIOSH on the development of an air cleaning or filtration technologies CSTD test protocol?

c. Drafted a new universal performance test protocol applicable to both barrier and air-cleaning types of CSTDs.

II. Protocol: The proposed protocol will apply to both barrier and air-cleaning types of CSTDs, NIOSH will host a public meeting to give an update of new protocol developments. The update will include discussions covering proposed drug surrogates, benefits, and challenges with developing a new universal test protocol, and to allow the public to comment. Special emphasis will be placed upon the following:

- Proposed surrogates: Surrogates were identified based on vapor pressure and water solubility. Drug surrogates were chosen with vapor pressures up to 100 times that of the most volatile drug vapor pressure known to exist on the NIOSH hazardous drug list. The increased surrogate vapor pressure should offer a safety factor to the test protocol.

- Is the 100 times the vapor pressure safety factor adequate?

- Should other chemical properties besides vapor pressure and water solubility be considered?

- Are there other surrogates NIOSH should consider for testing the performance of CSTDs?

- Will any of the NIOSH’s list of proposed surrogates cause damage to the CSTD plastic and/or parts (i.e., needles, septum, etc.)?

- Are there other aspects specific to air cleaning technologies that are not being adequately challenged with the proposed surrogate testing protocol?

- Are there other aspects specific to the barrier CSTD technologies that are not being adequately challenged with the proposed surrogate testing protocol?

- Sampling Strategy: The new draft protocol relies upon analytical chemistry analysis of at least two simultaneously-collected sorbent tube air samples to detect drug surrogate escape from the CSTD.

- Should less or more sampling tubes be used inside the environmental test chamber?

- How should the sampling tubes be positioned inside the environmental test chamber?

- Since contaminant levels will no longer be immediately known, background concentrations will not be realized until after test completion and sample analysis. What metrics should be applied to the background concentrations and how should they impact the reported concentrations observed during conduct of the protocol tasks?

- Design of environmental test chamber: NIOSH proposes to keep the same environmental test chamber as that proposed for the original vapor containment test protocol, however airflow through the chamber will cease during the actual test procedures and air sampling.

- Should NIOSH keep the current design of the environmental test chamber?

- If not, what other designs should be considered and what validation requirements should be placed upon them?

- Sampling for escaped surrogate will be performed by a sampling pump and air sampling tubes.

- Are there concerns that the sample pump discharge air plus task-associated hand movements will be insufficient to provide adequate air mixing?

- Compounding and Administration tasks:

- NIOSH has updated Task 1 and Task 2 in Appendix A of the performance test protocol to incorporate the adoption of CSTD manufacturers’ Instructions for Use (IFU).

- Should other manipulations be added or deleted from the current tasks listed in order to comply with a manufacturer’s IFU?

- For purposes of challenging a CSTD’s containment performance,
should the number of repetitions for each CSTD:Task pairing be less than or greater than 4?

- What special considerations has NIOSH not considered in developing the new draft performance test protocol?

III. Public Meeting: NIOSH will hold a public meeting to discuss a universal closed system drug-transfer device (CSTD) testing (draft) protocol entitled, A Performance Test Protocol for Closed System Transfer Devices Used During Pharmacy Compounding and Administration of Hazardous Drugs. The meeting will allow commenters the opportunity to address the new draft protocol, the proposed list of hazardous drug test surrogates, and to discuss NIOSH questions regarding the new protocol.

The meeting is open to the public, limited only by the capacity (80 attendees) of the conference room. Confirm your attendance to this meeting by sending an email to DHirst@cdc.gov by October 21, 2016. An email confirming registration will be sent from NIOSH and will include details needed to participate.

Registration is required for both in-person and LiveMeeting participation. An email confirming registration will be sent from NIOSH for both in-person participation and audio conferencing participation.

Details required to participate via the audio conferencing will be provided by NIOSH in a separate email. This option will be available to participants on a first come, first served basis and is limited to the first 100 participants.

- Non-U.S. Citizens: Because of CDC Security Regulations, any non-U.S. citizen wishing to attend this meeting by in-person must provide the following information to Deborah V. Hirst.

Requests to provide oral comments at the public meeting should be submitted by telephone (513) 841–4141, facsimile (513) 841–4506, or emailed to DHirst@cdc.gov with “Request to Speak” in the subject line. Requests can also be mailed to Deborah V. Hirst, 1090 Tusculum Ave., MS R–5, Cincinnati, OH 45226. All requests to speak should contain the name, address, telephone number, and relevant business affiliations of the speaker, and the approximate time requested for oral comments. Requests must be received by October 21, 2016.

Oral comments will be transcribed and included in the docket.

John Howard,
Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
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Supplement to National Technical Resource Center for the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program at the Utah State University—Grant Number U52MC04391.

SUMMARY: HRSA announces the award of a supplement in the amount of $300,000 for the National Technical Resource Center (NTRC) for the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention program cooperative agreement. Funding in future years is contingent upon satisfactory performance of the recipient, need, and availability of funds.

The purpose of the NTRC is to address new research, approaches, and practice advances in the fields of family engagement, early language acquisition, and early literacy. The supplement will fund Utah State University, the cooperative agreement recipient, during the budget periods of the supplement 4/1/2016–3/31/2020, to respond to changes in research, policy, technology, and practice in the newborn hearing screening field in the areas of family engagement, early language acquisition, and early literacy. Funding in FY 2017, FY 2018, and FY 2019, is contingent upon appropriations, satisfactory performance of the recipient, need, and availability of funds.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Intended Recipient of the Award: Utah State University.

Amount of Non-Competitive Awards: $300,000.


CFDA Number: 93.251.


JUSTIFICATION: In 2015, following an objective review of its applications, HRSA awarded the NTRC for the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention program cooperative agreement to Utah State University, a state institution of higher education. Authorized by the Public Health Service Act, § 399M, as added by the Children’s Health Act of 2000, § 702 (Pub. L. 106–310) and further amended by § 2 of the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–337) (42 U.S.C. 280g–1), the purpose of the Universal Newborn Hearing Screening (UNHS) program is to utilize specifically targeted and measurable interventions to increase the number of infants who are followed up for rescreening, referral, and intervention after not passing a