5–11–07 Friday
Vol. 72 No. 91 May 11, 2007

Pages 26709–27052

Federal Register

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, see *www.archives.gov.*

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge as one of the databases on GPO Access, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** *www.gpoaccess.gov/nara,* available through GPO Access, is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, Number 1 (January 2, 1994) forward.

For more information about GPO Access, contact the GPO Access User Support Team, call toll free 1-888-293-6498; DC area 202-512-1530; fax at 202-512-1262; or via e-mail at *gpoaccess@gpo.gov.* The Support Team is available between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday–Friday, except official holidays.

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $749 plus postage, or $808, plus postage, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $165, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, see *bookstore.gpo.gov.*

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 72 FR 12345.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC	
Subscriptions:	
Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**202–512–1806**
General online information	**202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498**
Single copies/back copies:	
Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)**
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
Subscriptions:	
Paper or fiche	**202–741–6005**
Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions	**202–741–6005**

Printed on recycled paper.

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 72, No. 91

Friday, May 11, 2007

Agriculture Department
See Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
See Commodity Credit Corporation
See Farm Service Agency
See Foreign Agricultural Service
See Forest Service
See Natural Resources Conservation Service
See Rural Housing Service
See Rural Utilities Service
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26772

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
RULES
Plant-related quarantine, foreign:
Cut flowers from countries with chrysanthemum white rust, 26711

Army Department
See Engineers Corps
NOTICES
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act:
Surplus properties; list; correction, 26867
Environmental statements; record of decision:
Ft. Bliss, TX and NM; land use; correction, 26867

Blind or Severely Disabled, Committee for Purchase From People Who Are
See Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
RULES
Medicare:
Long-term care hospitals; prospective payment system (2008 RY); annual payment rate updates and policy changes, 26870–27029
PROPOSED RULES
Medicare:
Home health prospective payment system; refinement and rate update (2008 CY); correction, 26867
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26819

Coast Guard
NOTICES
Meetings:
Houston/Galveston Navigation Safety Advisory Committee, 26822
Towing Safety Advisory Committee, 26822–26823

Commerce Department
See Industry and Security Bureau
See International Trade Administration
See Minority Business Development Agency
See National Institute of Standards and Technology
See National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled
NOTICES
Procurement list; additions and deletions, 26779–26780

Commodity Credit Corporation
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Agricultural commodities; emergency and temporary storage, 26772–26774

Defense Department
See Army Department
See Engineers Corps
See Navy Department
NOTICES
Arms sales notification; transmittal letter, etc., 26789–26799
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26799
Meetings:
Science Advisory Board, 26799–26800
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 26800

Disability Employment Policy Office
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Transition and Employment for Youth with Disabilities National Technical Assistance Center, 26836–26846

Drug Enforcement Administration
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26833–26835

Education Department
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26801–26803
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
William D. Ford Direct Loan Program, 26803–26808
Meetings:
National Board for Education Sciences, 26808

Employment and Training Administration
NOTICES
Adjustment assistance; applications, determinations, etc.:
Air System Components, Inc., 26846
Alan White Co., 26846–26847
Bayer Clothing Group Inc., 26848
Medtronic Vascular, 26848
Primary Staffing Services, Inc., 26848–26849
Rayolite, 26849
Sony Technology Center-Pittsburgh, 26849
Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc., 26849–26850

Energy Department
NOTICES
Electricity export and import authorizations, permits, etc.:
DC Energy, LLC, 26809

Meetings:
Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board—
Idaho National Laboratory, 26809–26810
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Otay Mesa Energy Center, LLC, 26808

Engineers Corps
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Baltimore City, MD; Patapsco River dredged material containment facility, 26800–26801

Environmental Protection Agency
RULES
Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning; designation of areas:
California, 26718–26721
PROPOSED RULES
Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning purposes; designation of areas:
Kentucky, 26759–26770
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26810–26813
Air pollution control:
State operating permits programs—
Alaska, 26813
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Agency comment availability, 26814
Agency weekly receipts, 26814–26815
Meetings:
Environmental Financial Advisory Board, 26815
Science Advisory Board, 26815–26816
Reports and guidance documents; availability, etc.:
Alternative asbestos control method and NESHAP method for demolition of asbestos-containing buildings; comparison, 26816–26817

Executive Office of the President
See Presidential Documents

Farm Service Agency
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26774

Federal Aviation Administration
RULES
Airworthiness directives:
Pacific Aerospace Ltd., 26716–26718
Turbomeca Arriel, 26711–26716

Federal Highway Administration
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26862–26864

Federal Reserve System
NOTICES
Banks and bank holding companies:
Formations, acquisitions, and mergers, 26817
Permissible nonbanking activities, 26817–26818

Foreign Agricultural Service
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26774–26775

Forest Service
NOTICES
Environmental statements; notice of intent:
National Forest System land management planning rule; potential environmental consequences, 26775–26776
Olympic National Forest, WA, 26776–26777
Meetings:
Resource Advisory Committees—
Ravalli County, 26777
Recreation fee areas:
Mendocino National Forest, CA; overnight rental fees, 26777–26778

General Services Administration
NOTICES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26799

Geological Survey
NOTICES
Meetings:
National Earthquake Prediction Evaluation Council, 26833

Health and Human Services Department
See Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
See Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26818
Meetings:
American Health Information Community, 26818–26819

Homeland Security Department
See Coast Guard
See U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
NOTICES
Meetings:
Privacy impact assessments at DHS; tutorial on how to write PIAs for Department of Homeland Security; public workshop, 26821

Housing and Urban Development Department
PROPOSED RULES
Mortgage and loan insurance programs:
Single family mortgage insurance—
Mortgaged property; mortgagor's investment standards, 27048–27051
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26825–26827
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Bremerton WA; Westpark master plan redevelopment project, 26827
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Discretionary programs (SuperNOFA)
Supplementary information and technical corrections, 27032–27045
Homeless assistance; excess and surplus Federal properties, 26827–26832

Industry and Security Bureau
NOTICES
Export privileges, actions affecting:
Mahmood, Khalid, 26780–26781

Interior Department
See Geological Survey
NOTICES
Committees; establishment, renewal, termination, etc.:
Climate Change Science program Committee for Synthesis and Assessment Product 1.2: Past Climate Variability and Change in Arctic and at High Latitudes, 26832
Climate Change Science program Committee for Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.2: Thresholds of Climate Change, 26832
Meetings:
Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Advisory Committee; canceled, 26832–26833

International Trade Administration
NOTICES
Antidumping:
Brake rotors from—
China, 26781–26782
Freshwater crawfish tail meat from—
China, 26782–26783

Justice Department
See Drug Enforcement Administration
See Justice Programs Office

Justice Programs Office
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26835–26836

Labor Department
See Disability Employment Policy Office
See Employment and Training Administration

Minority Business Development Agency
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Native American Business Enterprise Center Program, 26783–26787

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NOTICES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26799

National Institute of Standards and Technology
NOTICES
Meetings:
Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award Judges Panel, 26787–26788
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Board of Overseers, 26788

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
RULES
Endangered and threatened species:
Puget Sound steelhead; final listing determinations, 26722–26735
Fishery conservation and management:
Atlantic highly migratory species—
Atlantic billfish; tournament management measures, 26735–26741
PROPOSED RULES
Fishery conservation and management:
Northeastern United States fisheries—
Yellowtail flounder, 26770–26771
Western Pacific fisheries—
Hawaii-based charter fishery for pelagic fishes; control date, 26771
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, AK; seismic surveys, 26788

National Science Foundation
NOTICES
Meetings:
Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Advisory Committee, 26850

Natural Resources Conservation Service
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Florence Flood Retarding Structure Supplemental Watershed Plan, AZ, 26778

Navy Department
NOTICES
Meetings:
Naval Academy Board of Visitors, 26801

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Plants and materials; physical protection:
Unescorted access to research and test reactors; fingerprinting and criminal history check requirements; correction, 26850–26852
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 26850

Peace Corps
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26852

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
NOTICES
Meetings:
Hazardous materials transportation; loading and unloading incident risk reduction; public workshop, 26864

Presidential Documents
EXECUTIVE ORDERS
Committees; establishment, renewal, termination, etc.:
Iraq Transition Assistance Office; establishment (EO 13431), 26709–26710

Rural Housing Service
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26778–26779

Rural Utilities Service
PROPOSED RULES
Rural broadband access loans and loan guarantees; deployment modifications, 26742–26759

Securities and Exchange Commission
NOTICES
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 26852–26853
Self-regulatory organizations; proposed rule changes:
American Stock Exchange LLC, 26853–26854
International Securities Exchange, LLC, 26854–26856
National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 26856–26858
National Futures Association, 26858–26861
Options Clearing Corp., 26861–26862

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

NOTICES
Federal agency urine drug testing; certified laboratories meeting minimum standards; list, 26819–26821

Surface Transportation Board
NOTICES
Railroad operation, acquisition, construction, etc.:
New York & Greenwood Lake Railway, 26865
Rail services abandonment:
Central Railroad Co. of Indianapolis, 26865

Thrift Supervision Office
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26865–26866

Transportation Department
See Federal Aviation Administration
See Federal Highway Administration
See Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
See Surface Transportation Board
NOTICES
Aviation proceedings:
Agreements filed; weekly receipts, 26862
Certificates of public convenience and necessity and foreign air carrier permits; weekly applications, 26862

Treasury Department
See Thrift Supervision Office
See United States Mint

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities; proposals, submissions, and approvals, 26823–26825

United States Mint
NOTICES
American eagle platinum proof and uncirculated coins; price increase, 26866

Separate Parts In This Issue

Part II
Health and Human Services Department, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 26870–27029

Part III
Housing and Urban Development Department, 27032–27045

Part IV
Housing and Urban Development Department, 27048–27051

Reader Aids
Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, reminders, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV electronic mailing list, go to http://listserv.access.gpo.gov and select Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings); then follow the instructions.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

3 CFR
Executive Orders:
13431.....26709
7 CFR
319.....26711
Proposed Rules:
1738.....26742
14 CFR
39 (3 documents) 26711, 26714, 26716
24 CFR
Proposed Rules:
203.....27048
40 CFR
52.....26718
81.....26718
Proposed Rules:
52.....26759
81.....26759
42 CFR
412.....26870
413.....26870
Proposed Rules:
484.....26887
50 CFR
223.....26722
635.....26735
Proposed Rules:
648.....26770
665.....26771

Federal Register
Vol. 72, No. 91
Friday, May 11, 2007

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Executive Order 13431 of May 8, 2007

Establishment of Temporary Organization To Facilitate United States Government Assistance for Transition in Iraq

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 202 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 2656) and section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment.* There is established within the Department of State, in accordance with section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, a temporary organization to be known as the Iraq Transition Assistance Office (ITAO).

Sec. 2. *Purpose of the Temporary Organization.* The purpose of the ITAO shall be to perform the specific project of supporting executive departments and agencies in concluding remaining large infrastructure projects expeditiously in Iraq, in facilitating Iraq's transition to self-sufficiency, and in maintaining an effective diplomatic presence in Iraq.

Sec. 3. *Functions of the Temporary Organization.* In carrying out its purpose set forth in section 2, the ITAO shall:

(a) support executive departments and agencies in Iraq in their implementation of United States Government foreign assistance in Iraq;

(b) continue coordination, oversight, and reporting concerning remaining Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) monies;

(c) assume the functions assigned to the Iraq Reconstruction Management Office (IRMO) remaining as of the date of this order; and

(d) perform such other functions related to the specific project set forth in section 2 as the Secretary of State (Secretary) may assign.

Sec. 4. *Personnel and Administration.* (a) The ITAO shall be headed by a Director selected by the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary shall transfer from the IRMO to the ITAO the personnel, assets, liabilities, and records of the IRMO.

Sec. 5. *General Provisions.* (a) This order shall be implemented in accordance with applicable law, subject to the availability of appropriations, and consistent with presidential guidance.

(b) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right, benefit, or privilege, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, instrumentalities, or entities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

(c) The ITAO shall terminate at the end of the maximum period permitted by section 3161(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, unless sooner terminated by the Secretary.



THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 8, 2007.

[FR Doc. 07–2367
Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
Billing code 3195–01–P

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 72, No. 91
Friday, May 11, 2007

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

7 CFR Part 319

[Docket No. 03–016–4]

RIN 0579–AC18

Cut Flowers From Countries With Chrysanthemum White Rust

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule; stay of certain provisions.

SUMMARY: We recently published a final rule amending the cut flowers regulations to establish specific requirements for the importation of cut flowers that are hosts of chrysanthemum white rust (CWR) from countries where the disease is known to occur. The final rule had an effective date of May 3, 2007. In order to allow affected exporters of cut flowers and the national plant protection organizations of countries where CWR is known to occur additional time to make necessary preparations to comply with certain new inspection and certification procedures that will be required as a result of the final rule, we are staying a portion of the amended regulations for 30 days from the effective date of our final rule.

DATES: Effective May 11, 2007, 7 CFR 319.74–2(d)(3) is stayed until June 2, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Tony Roman, Import Specialist, Commodity Import Analysis and Operation, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–8758.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 7 CFR part 319 prohibit or restrict the importation of plants, plant parts, and related materials to prevent the introduction of plant pests into the United States. The regulations in ''Subpart—Nursery Stock, Plants, Roots, Bulbs, Seeds, and Other Plant Products,'' §§ 319.37 through 319.37–14 (referred to below as the nursery stock regulations) restrict, among other things, the importation of living plants, plant parts, and seeds for propagation. Conditions governing the importation of cut flowers into the United States are contained in ''Subpart-Cut Flowers'' (§§ 319.74–1 through 319.74–4, referred to below as the cut flowers regulations).

On April 3, 2007, we published in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 15805–15812, Docket No. 03–016–3) a final rule amending the cut flowers regulations to establish specific requirements for the importation of cut flowers that are hosts of chrysanthemum white rust (CWR) from countries where the disease is known to occur. We also amended the nursery stock regulations to update lists of countries where CWR is known to occur. The final rule had an effective date of May 3, 2007.

We recently received communications from industry representatives and the Government of Colombia expressing concern that the May 3, 2007, effective date of the final rule did not allow adequate time for those entities to prepare to comply with the new inspection and certification procedures that will be required under § 319.74–2(d)(3) of the cut flowers regulations as a result of the final rule. A delay in the implementation of those new requirements was requested. After considering those requests, we have elected to allow an additional 30 days for those entities to prepare to comply with those new requirements. To provide that additional time, we are staying § 319.74–2(d)(3) until June 2, 2007.

We explained in the proposed rule that preceded our April 3, 2007, final rule, as well as in the final rule itself, that we have been administratively regulating cut flowers from countries where CWR is known to occur since 1974, and that those measures have been effective in preventing the introduction of CWR on cut flowers from those countries. During the time that § 319.74–2(d)(3) is stayed, we will continue to apply our existing administrative restrictions on cut flowers from countries where CWR is known to occur.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 3rd day of May 2007.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9151 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2005–23809; Directorate Identifier 2005–NE–52–AD; Amendment 39–15048; AD 2007–10–07]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 2B Series Turboshaft Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are superseding an existing airworthiness directive (AD) by adopting a new AD for the products listed above. This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

The deterioration of the splines on the HP/LP pump assembly drive shaft may eventually interrupt fuel supply and cause uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown. The result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.

Two cases of in-flight shutdown resulting from splines deterioration have been reported for the ARRIUS 2B1 engine, which has the same HP/LP pump drive design as the ARRIEL 2. These cases prompted us to require the inspection at 500 hours and each time the HMU is removed/installed.

This AD modifies the content of the previous DGAC France AD F–2005–188 (EASA Approval Number 2005–6408) in adding a one time inspection within 30

operating hours from effective date of this AD as well as HMU re-installation according to a maintenance task modified to avoid this kind of wrong assembly. This has been set up following one case of improper clipping of the coupling shaft onto the drive gear shaft, which resulted in an uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown (on a twin engine rotorcraft). This precaution measure has been taken only on engines powering single engine rotorcraft.

This AD requires actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: This AD becomes effective May 29, 2007.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 292 73 2812, Update No. 4, dated January 2, 2007, listed in the AD, as of May 29, 2007.

We must receive comments on this AD by June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *DOT Docket Web Site:* Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- *Fax:* (202) 493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov*; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5227) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Spinney, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: *Christopher.spinney@faa.gov*; telephone (781) 238–7175; fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Streamlined Issuance of AD

The FAA is implementing a new process for streamlining the issuance of ADs related to MCAI. This streamlined process will allow us to adopt MCAI safety requirements in a more efficient manner and will reduce safety risks to the public. This process continues to follow all FAA AD issuance processes to meet legal, economic, Administrative Procedure Act, and **Federal Register** requirements. We also continue to meet our technical decision-making responsibilities to identify and correct unsafe conditions on U.S.-certificated products.

This AD references the MCAI and related service information that we considered in forming the engineering basis to correct the unsafe condition. The AD contains text copied from the MCAI and for this reason might not follow our plain language principles.

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Community, has issued AD 2007–0044, dated February 27, 2007 (referred to after this as ''the MCAI''), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

> The deterioration of the splines on the HP/LP pump assembly drive shaft may eventually interrupt fuel supply and cause uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown. The result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.
>
> Two cases of in-flight shutdown resulting from splines deterioration have been reported for the ARRIUS 2B1 engine, which has the same HP/LP pump drive design as the ARRIEL 2. These cases prompted us to require the inspection at 500 hours and each time the HMU is removed/installed.
>
> This AD modifies the content of the previous DGAC France AD F–2005–188 (EASA Approval Number 2005–6408) in adding a one time inspection within 30 operating hours from effective date of this AD as well as HMU re-installation according to a maintenance task modified to avoid this kind of wrong assembly. This has been set up following one case of improper clipping of the coupling shaft onto the drive gear shaft, which resulted in an uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown (on a twin engine rotorcraft). This precaution measure has been taken only on engines powering single engine rotorcraft.

You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

This AD supersedes AD 2006–21–10, Amendment 39–14795 (71 FR 61634, October 19, 2006), which we issued in response to DGAC France AD F–2005–188.

Relevant Service Information

Turbomeca has issued Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 292 73 2812, Update No. 4, dated January 2, 2007. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, they have notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are issuing this AD because we evaluated all the information provided by the State of Design Authority and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design. This AD requires the following:

- Visually inspecting splines of the coupling shaft assembly and the HP pump drive gear shaft for wear, within 30 hours-in-service from the effective date of this AD for engines that were previously inspected using Update 2 of MSB 292 73 2812;
- For engines that were not previously inspected using Update 2 of MSB 292 73 2812, visual inspection within 50 hours-in-service after the effective date of this AD for hydraulic mechanical units (HMUs) that have accumulated 450 or more hours time-since-new (TSN) or time-since-overhaul (TSO) on the effective date of this AD;
- For HMUs that have fewer than 450 hours TSN or TSO on the effective date of this AD, visual inspection after accumulating 450 hours TSN or TSO, but before accumulating 500 hours TSN or TSO;
- Repetitive inspections every time you remove or install the HMU.

Differences Between the AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have required different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies.

Any such differences are described in a separate paragraph of the AD. These requirements take precedence over the actions copied from the MCAI.

FAA's Determination of the Effective Date

An unsafe condition exists that requires the immediate adoption of this AD. The FAA has found that the risk to the flying public justifies waiving notice and comment prior to adoption of this rule because the compliance time required to correct the unsafe condition does not allow opportunity for prior public comment. Therefore, we determined that notice and opportunity for public comment before issuing this AD are impracticable and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in fewer than 30 days.

Comments Invited

This AD is a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety, and we did not precede it by notice and opportunity for public comment. We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2005–23809; Directorate Identifier 2005–NE–52–AD'' at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://dms.dot.gov,* including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this AD.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. ''Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,'' describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in ''Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this AD:

1. Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866;

2. Is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and

3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

■ Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by removing Amendment 39–14795 (71 FR 61634, October 19, 2006) and by adding the following new AD:

2007–10–07 Turbomeca: Amendment 39–15048.; Docket No. FAA–2005–23809; Directorate Identifier 2005–NE–52–AD.

Effective Date

(a) This airworthiness directive (AD) becomes effective May 29, 2007.

Affected ADs

(b) This AD supersedes AD 2006–21–10.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Turbomeca Arriel 2B, 2B1, and 2B1A turboshaft engines. These engines are installed on, but not limited to, Eurocopter AS350B3 and EC130B4 helicopters.

Reason

(d) European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD No. 2007–0044, dated April 27, 2007, states:

The deterioration of the splines on the HP/LP pump assembly drive shaft may eventually interrupt fuel supply and cause uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown. The result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.

Two cases of in-flight shutdown resulting from splines deterioration have been reported for the ARRIUS 2B1 engine, which has the same HP/LP pump drive design as the ARRIEL 2. These cases prompted us to require the inspection at 500 hours and each time the HMU is removed/installed.

This AD modifies the content of the previous DGAC France AD F–2005–188 (EASA Approval Number 2005–6408) in adding a one time inspection within 30 operating hours from effective date of this AD as well as HMU re-installation according to a maintenance task modified to avoid this kind of wrong assembly. This has been set up following a one case of improper clipping of the coupling shaft onto the drive gear shaft, which resulted in an uncommanded in-flight engine shutdown (on a twin engine rotorcraft). This precaution measure has been taken only on engines powering single engine rotorcraft.

Actions and Compliance

(e) Unless already done, do the following actions.

(f) Perform an initial visual inspection of the splines of the coupling assembly and the high pressure (HP) pump drive gear shaft for wear. Use 2.A. through 2.C.(2) of the Instructions to be Incorporated of Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) No. 292 73 2812, Update No. 4, dated January 2, 2007, as follows:

(1) Inspect within 30 hours-in-service from the effective date of this AD for engines that were previously inspected using Update 2 of MSB 292 73 2812.

(2) For engines that were not previously inspected using Update 2 of MSB 292 73 2812, inspect as follows:

(i) Inspect within 50 hours-in-service after the effective date of this AD for hydraulic mechanical units (HMUs) that have accumulated 450 or more hours time-since-new (TSN) or time-since-overhaul (TSO) on the effective date of this AD. Replace the HMU if worn beyond limits.

(ii) Inspect after accumulating 450 hours TSN or TSO, but before accumulating 500 hours TSN or TSO for HMUs that have fewer than 450 hours TSN or TSO on the effective date of this AD. Replace the HMU if worn beyond limits.

Repetitive Visual Inspections

(g) Thereafter, perform a visual inspection of the splines of the coupling shaft assembly and the HP pump drive gear shaft for wear every time you remove the HMU. Use 2.A. through 2.C.(2) of the Instructions to be Incorporated of Turbomeca MSB No. 292 73 2812, Update No. 4, dated January 2, 2007. Replace the HMU and coupling shaft assembly if worn beyond limits.

FAA AD Differences

(h) None.

Other FAA AD Provisions

(i) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, Engine Certification Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) *Airworthy Product:* For any requirement in this AD, to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) *Reporting Requirements:* For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

Related Information

(j) Refer to European Aviation Safety Agency AD 2007–0044, dated February 27, 2007, for related information.

(k) Contact Christopher Spinney, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: *Christopher.spinney@faa.gov*; telephone (781) 238–7175; fax (781) 238–7199, for more information about this AD.

Material Incorporated by Reference

(l) You must use Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 292 73 2812, Update No. 4, dated January 2, 2007, to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of this service information under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Turbomeca, 40220 Tarnos—France; Tel (33) 05 59 74 40 00; Telex 570 042; Fax (33) 05 59 74 45 15.

(3) You may review copies at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call (202) 741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 4, 2007.

Peter A. White,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E7–8991 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2007–28009; Directorate Identifier 2007–NE–16–AD; Amendment 39–15047; AD 2007–10–06]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 2B1 Turboshaft Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

Two cases of flameout have been reported on Arriel 2B1 engines: One when lowering collective pitch on ground at landing and one when switching from Flight Position to idle Position on ground.

Both flameout events are explained as follows:

In case of stepper motor loss of steps to a value below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold, the fuel flow of the anti-flameout limit can be reduced.

The reduction can be sufficient to cause an engine flameout when decreasing rapidly the demand for power (it can therefore also happen in-flight).

This condition may lead to an uncommanded in-flight shutdown. On a single-engine helicopter, the result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.

To prevent this, software version 5.02 (TU 144C) increases the anti-flameout limit in the event of small stepper motor loss of steps (below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold).

This AD requires actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: This AD becomes effective May 29, 2007.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) No. 292 73 2144, dated January 5, 2007, listed in the AD as of May 29, 2007.

We must receive comments on this AD by June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *DOT Docket Web Site:* Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- *Fax:* (202) 493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov*; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5227) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Spinney, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: *Christopher.spinney@faa.gov*; telephone (781) 238–7175; fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Streamlined Issuance of AD

The FAA is implementing a new process for streamlining the issuance of ADs related to MCAI. This streamlined process will allow us to adopt MCAI safety requirements in a more efficient manner and will reduce safety risks to the public. This process continues to follow all FAA AD issuance processes to meet legal, economic, Administrative Procedure Act, and **Federal Register** requirements. We also continue to meet our technical decision-making responsibilities to identify and correct unsafe conditions on U.S.-certificated products.

This AD references the MCAI and related service information that we considered in forming the engineering basis to correct the unsafe condition. The AD contains text copied from the MCAI and for this reason might not follow our plain language principles.

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European

Community, has issued AD 2007–0085, dated April 2, 2007 (referred to after this as ''the MCAI''), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

> Two cases of flameout have been reported on Arriel 2B1 engines: One when lowering collective pitch on ground at landing and one when switching from Flight Position to idle Position on ground.
>
> Both flameout events are explained as follows:
>
> In case of stepper motor loss of steps to a value below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold, the fuel flow of the anti-flameout limit can be reduced.
>
> The reduction can be sufficient to cause an engine flameout when decreasing rapidly the demand for power (it can therefore also happen in-flight).
>
> This condition may lead to an uncommanded in-flight shutdown. On a single-engine helicopter, the result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.
>
> To prevent this, software version 5.02 (TU 144C) increases the anti-flameout limit in the event of small stepper motor loss of steps (below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold).

You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

Turbomeca has issued Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 292 73 2144, dated January 5, 2005. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, they have notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are issuing this AD because we evaluated all the information provided by the State of Design Authority and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design. This AD requires downloading DECU software version 5.02 as soon as practicable, but no later than August 31, 2007.

Differences Between the AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have required different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies. Any such differences are described in a separate paragraph of the AD. These requirements take precedence over the actions copied from the MCAI.

FAA's Determination of the Effective Date

An unsafe condition exists that requires the immediate adoption of this AD. The FAA has found that the risk to the flying public justifies waiving notice and comment prior to adoption of this rule. The compliance time needed to correct the unsafe condition requires action as soon as practicable after the effective date of this AD, but no later than August 31, 2007. This short compliance time does not afford the opportunity for prior public comment. Therefore, we determined that notice and opportunity for public comment before issuing this AD are impracticable and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in fewer than 30 days.

Comments Invited

This AD is a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety, and we did not precede it by notice and opportunity for public comment. We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2007–28009; Directorate Identifier 2007–NE–16–AD'' at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://dms.dot.gov*, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this AD.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. ''Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,'' describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in ''Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this AD:

1. Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866;

2. Is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and

3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

■ Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

2007–10–06 Turbomeca: Amendment 39–15047; Docket No. FAA–2007–28009; Directorate Identifier 2007–NE–16–AD.

Effective Date

(a) This airworthiness directive (AD) becomes effective May 29, 2007.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Turbomeca Arriel 2B1 turboshaft engines. These engines are installed on, but not limited to, Eurocopter AS 350 B3 and EC 130 B4 single-engine helicopters.

Reason

(d) European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD No. 2007–0085, dated April 2, 2007, states:

Two cases of flameout have been reported on Arriel 2B1 engines: one when lowering collective pitch on ground at landing and one when switching from Flight Position to idle Position on ground.

Both flameout events are explained as follows:

In case of stepper motor loss of steps to a value below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold, the fuel flow of the anti-flameout limit can be reduced.

The reduction can be sufficient to cause an engine flameout when decreasing rapidly the demand for power (it can therefore also happen in-flight).

This condition may lead to an uncommanded in-flight shutdown. On a single-engine helicopter, the result may be an emergency autorotation landing or, at worst, an accident.

To prevent this, software version 5.02 (TU 144C) increases the anti-flameout limit in the event of small stepper motor loss of steps (below the ''level 1 failure'' detection threshold).

Actions and Compliance

(e) Unless already done, do the following actions.

(1) As soon as practicable, but no later than August 31, 2007, modify the digital electronic control unit (DECU) by downloading the TU144C software version 5.02, using the Instructions to be Incorporated of Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) No. 292 73 2144, dated January 5, 2007.

(2) Send Turbomeca the DECU replacement compliance certificate, as specified in paragraph 2D(1)(a)3 of Turbomeca MSB No. 292 73 2144, dated January 5, 2007.

FAA AD Differences

(f) None.

Other FAA AD Provisions

(g) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, Engine Certification Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) *Airworthy Product:* For any requirement in this AD, to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) *Reporting Requirements:* For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

Related Information

(h) Refer to European Aviation Safety Agency AD 2007–0085, dated April 2, 2007, for related information.

(i) Contact Christopher Spinney, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: *Christopher.spinney@faa.gov*; telephone (781) 238–7175; fax (781) 238–7199, for more information about this AD.

Material Incorporated by Reference

(j) You must use Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 292 73 2144, dated January 5, 2007, to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of this service information under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Turbomeca, 40220 Tarnos—France; Tel (33) 05 59 74 40 00; Telex 570 042; Fax (33) 05 59 74 45 15.

(3) You may review copies at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call (202) 741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on May 4, 2007.

Peter A. White,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E7–8992 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2007–27859; Directorate Identifier 2007–CE–033–AD; Amendment 39–15049; AD 2007–10–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Model 750XL Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

* * *failure of the Autopilot System Computer resulting in the possibility of an out of trim condition, which may lead to loss of aircraft control * * *

This AD requires actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: This AD becomes effective June 15, 2007.

On June 15, 2007 the Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in this AD.

We must receive comments on this AD by June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- *DOT Docket Web Site:* Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- *Fax:* (202) 493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov*; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5227) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karl Schletzbaum, Aerospace Engineer, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4146; fax: (816) 329–4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Streamlined Issuance of AD

The FAA is implementing a new process for streamlining the issuance of ADs related to MCAI. The streamlined

process will allow us to adopt MCAI safety requirements in a more efficient manner and will reduce safety risks to the public. This process continues to follow all FAA AD issuance processes to meet legal, economic, Administrative Procedure Act, and **Federal Register** requirements. We also continue to meet our technical decision-making responsibilities to identify and correct unsafe conditions on U.S.-certificated products.

This AD references the MCAI and related service information that we considered in forming the engineering basis to correct the unsafe condition. The AD contains text copied from the MCAI and for this reason might not follow our plain language principles.

Discussion

The Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand, which is the aviation authority for New Zealand, has issued DCA/750XL/12A, drafted: March 27, 2007, effective date: March 29, 2007 (referred to after this as ''the MCAI''), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

* * *failure of the Autopilot System Computer resulting in the possibility of an out of trim condition, which may lead to loss of aircraft control * * *

The MCAI requires disconnection of the autopilot, inspection of the pitch servo, and modification of the autopilot pitch trim circuit. You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

Pacific Aerospace Limited has issued Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of the AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, they have notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are issuing this AD because we evaluated all information provided by the State of Design Authority and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design.

Currently within the United States there are no known Pacific Aerospace Limited Model 750XL airplanes with an S-Tec X55 autopilot system installed. There are no products of this type currently registered in the United States. However, this rule is necessary to ensure that the described unsafe condition is addressed if any of these products are placed on the U.S. Register in the future.

Differences Between This AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have required different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies. Any such differences are highlighted in a Note within the AD.

Comments Invited

Since there are currently no domestic operators of this product, notice and opportunity for public comment before issuing this AD are unnecessary.

This AD is a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety, and we did not precede it by notice and opportunity for public comment. We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2007–27859; Directorate Identifier 2007–CE–033–AD'' at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://dms.dot.gov,* including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this AD.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. ''Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,'' describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in ''Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866;

(2) Is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

■ Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

2007–10–08 Pacific Aerospace Limited: Amendment 39–15049; Docket No. FAA–2007–27859; Directorate Identifier 2007–CE–033–AD.

Effective Date

(a) This airworthiness directive (AD) becomes effective June 15, 2007.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Model 750XL airplanes, serial numbers 125, 126, and 127, certificated in any category.

Subject

(d) Air Transport Association of America (ATA) Code 22: Autopilot.

Reason

(e) The mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) states:

* * * failure of the Autopilot System Computer resulting in the possibility of an out of trim condition, which may lead to loss of aircraft control* * *

Actions and Compliance

(f) Unless already done, do the following actions before further flight.

(1) Modify the autopilot pitch trim circuit with additional protective features following Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007.

(2) Inspect the Pitch Servo to confirm part number (P/N) 108–15–P1 is installed following Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007.

(i) If Pitch Servo P/N 108–15–P1 is installed, no further action is necessary.

(ii) If Pitch Servo P/N 108–15–P1 is not installed, replace the Pitch Servo with P/N 108–15–P1 following Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007.

FAA AD Differences

Note: This AD differs from the MCAI and/or service information as follows:

(1) The MCAI requires an interim action of disconnecting the autopilot following Pacific Aerospace Limited Alert Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/001, dated February 16, 2007. Since there are no products of this type currently registered in the United States, and Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007, supersedes Pacific Aerospace Limited Alert Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/001, dated February 16, 2007, we are not requiring disconnection of the autopilot. Instead we require the autopilot comply with the terminating actions in Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007.

(2) The MCAI allows modification of the pitch trim circuit within 150 hours time-in-service. Since there are no products of this type currently registered in the United States, we are requiring modification of the pitch trim circuit before a domestic airworthiness certificate can be issued.

Other FAA AD Provisions

(g) The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Send information to ATTN: Karl Schletzbaum, Aerospace Engineer, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4146; fax: (816) 329–4090. Before using any approved AMOC on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your appropriate principal inspector (PI) in the FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), or lacking a PI, your local FSDO.

(2) *Airworthy Product:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) *Reporting Requirements:* For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

Related Information

(h) Refer to MCAI Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand AD DCA/750XL/12A, drafted: March 27, 2007, effective date: March 29, 2007; and Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007, for related information.

Material Incorporated by Reference

(i) You must use Pacific Aerospace Limited Mandatory Service Bulletin PACSB/XL/025, dated March 5, 2007, to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of this service information under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Pacific Aerospace Limited, Hamilton Airport, Private Bag HN3027, Hamilton, New Zealand; telephone: (64) 7–843–6144; fax: (64) 7–843–6134.

(3) You may review copies at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.*

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on May 4, 2007.

Charles L. Smalley,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E7–8993 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA–R09–OAR–2007–0101; FRL–8308–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: California

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is granting a request submitted by the State to redesignate the South Coast from nonattainment to attainment for the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA is also approving a state implementation plan (SIP) revision for the South Coast nonattainment area in California as meeting the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements for maintenance plans for carbon monoxide (CO). EPA is finding adequate and approving motor vehicle emission budgets, which are included in the maintenance plan. Finally, EPA is approving the California motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) program as meeting the low enhanced I/M requirements for CO in the South Coast.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This rule is effective on June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at EPA Region 9's Air Planning Office (AIR–2), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901. Due to increased security, we suggest that you call at least 24 hours prior to visiting the Regional Office so that we can make arrangements to have someone meet you.

Electronic Availability

This document and our proposed rule, which was published on February 14, 2007, are also available at *www.regulations.gov* for docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2007–0101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Jesson, U.S. EPA Region 9, 415–972–3961, *david.jesson@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, the terms ''we,'' ''us,'' and ''our'' mean U.S. EPA.

Table of Contents

I. Proposed Action
II. Public Comments
III. Final Action
IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Proposed Action

On February 14, 2007 (72 FR 6986), we proposed to approve the 2005 Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the South Coast Air Basin (Maintenance Plan) as meeting the requirements of CAA sections 107(d)(3)(E) and 175A. We also proposed to approve and find adequate the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) submitted with the Maintenance Plan.

We proposed to approve the request by the State of California to redesignate the area to attainment for CO under the provisions of CAA section 107(d)(3)(E). Section 107(d)(3)(E) authorizes the EPA Administrator to redesignate areas to attainment if the area has attained the NAAQS due to permanent and enforceable emission reductions, and the approved SIP for the area meets all of the applicable requirements of CAA section 110 (basic requirements applicable to SIPs generally), Part D (special SIP requirements applicable to nonattainment areas), and 175A (SIP requirements for maintenance areas).

As part of our proposed determination that California has met applicable Part D provisions, we proposed to adapt to CO nonattainment areas the provisions of our Clean Data Policy, which was initially established for ozone (see discussion at 72 FR 6989). Under the Clean Data Policy, certain CAA Part D requirements—including the requirements for developing attainment demonstrations, reasonable further progress (RFP) plans, reasonably available control measures (RACM) and contingency measures—no longer apply because the area has already attained the NAAQS.

Finally, because our interim approval of California's I/M program for CO in the South Coast expired on August 7, 1998, California submitted a demonstration that the I/M program meets the low-enhanced requirements applicable to the South Coast CO nonattainment area (see discussion in section III.B.4. We proposed to approve that demonstration.

II. Public Comments

Our February 14, 2007 proposed rule provided a 30-day public comment period, which closed on March 16, 2007. We received no comments on our proposal during this period.

III. Final Action

We are taking final action to redesignate the South Coast from nonattainment to attainment for the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) under CAA section 107(d)(3)(E).

We are approving the following SIP revision as meeting the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements for maintenance plans for carbon monoxide (CO) under CAA section 175A: *2005 Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the South Coast Air Basin,* adopted by the SCAQMD on March 4, 2005, and adopted and submitted by the CARB on February 24, 2006.[1]

We are approving Appendix V, page V–5–4, Table 5–2—''Carbon Monoxide Emissions (tons/day) Projected from 1993 through 2000 for the South Coast Air Basin,'' in the *1997 CO Plan for the South Coast*, adopted by SCAQMD on November 15, 1996, and adopted and submitted by CARB on February 5, 1997, as meeting the requirements of CAA section 187(b)(2) relating to transportation control measures to offset emissions associated with growth in vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips.

We are finding adequate and approving under CAA section 176(c) the following motor vehicle emission budgets included in the maintenance plan: 2888 tons per day of CO for 2005, and 2137 tons per day of CO for 2010, 2015, and 2020.

We are approving the State's demonstration that the California motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) program meets the low enhanced I/M requirements for CO in the South Coast under CAA section 187(a)(6). The State's I/M program submittal of January 22, 1996, remains an approved part of the SIP, following its approval on January 8, 1997 (62 FR 1150).

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, (Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves changes to state law as meeting Federal requirements, and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 97249, November 9, 2000), nor will it have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves a State rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the CAA. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it approves a state plan implementing a Federal Standard.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other

[1] A letter from CARB dated August 11, 2006, contained information related to the enhanced I/M program, but we are not incorporating this letter in the approved SIP.

required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a major rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by July 10, 2007. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Dated: April 24, 2007.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region 9.

■ 40 CFR parts 52 and 81 are amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding subparagraph (c)(247)(i)(A)(6) and adding paragraph (c)(346) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(247) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(*6*) Appendix V, page V–5–4, Table 5–2—''Carbon Monoxide Emissions (tons/day) Projected from 1993 through 2000 for the South Coast Air Basin.''

* * * * *

(346) New and amended plans for the following AQMD were submitted on February 24, 2006, by the Governor's designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

(1) 2005 Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the South Coast Air Basin, as adopted by SCAQMD on March 4, 2005, and by California Air Resources Board on February 24, 2006.

PART 81—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart C—[Amended]

■ 2. In § 81.305, the table ''California—Carbon Monoxide'' is amended by revising the entry for ''Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin Area'' to read as follows:

§ 81.305 California.

* * * * *

CALIFORNIA—CARBON MONOXIDE

Designated area	Designation		Classification	
	Date [1]	Type	Date	Type
* * *	*	*	*	*
Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin Area	6/11/07	Attainment.		
Los Angeles County (part)—that portion of Los Angeles County which lies south and west of a line described as follows: 1. Beginning at the Los Angeles-San Bernardino County boundary and running west along the township line common to Township 3 North and Township 2 North, San Bernardino Base and Meridian; 2. Then north along the range line common to Range 8 West and Range 9 West; 3. Then west along the township line common to Township 4 North and Township 3 North; 4. Then north along the range line common to Range 12 West and Range 13 West to the southeast corner of Section 12, Township 5 North and Range 13 West; 5. Then west along the south boundaries of Sections 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, and 7, Township 5 North and Range 13 West to the boundary of the Angeles National Forest which is collinear with the range line common to Range 13 West and Range 14 West; 6. Then north and west along the Angeles National Forest boundary to the point of intersection with the township line common to Township 7 North and Township 6 North (point is at the northwest corner of Section 4 in Township 6 North and Range 14 West); 7. Tthen west along the township line common to Township 7 North and Township 6 North; 8. Then north along the range line common to Range 15 West and Range 16 West to the southeast corner of Section 13, Township 7 North and Range 16 West;				

CALIFORNIA—CARBON MONOXIDE—Continued

Designated area	Designation		Classification	
	Date [1]	Type	Date	Type
9. Then along the south boundaries of Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, Township 7 North and Range 16 West;				
10. Then north along the range line common to Range 16 West and Range 17 West to the north boundary of the Angeles National Forest (collinear with the township line common to Township 8 North and Township 7 North);				
11. Then west along the Angeles National Forest boundary to the point of intersection with the south boundary of the Rancho La Liebre Land Grant;				
12. Then west and north along this land grant boundary to the Los Angeles-Kern County boundary.				
Orange County:				
Riverside County (part)—that portion of Riverside County which lies to the west of a line described as follows:				
1. Beginning at the Riverside—San Diego County boundary and running north along the range line common to Range 4 East and Range 3 East, San Bernardino Base and Meridian;				
2. Then east along the township line common to Township 8 South and Township 7 South;				
3. Then north along the range line common to Range 5 East and Range 4 East;				
4. Then west along the township line common to Township 6 South and Township 7 South to the southwest corner of Section 34, Township 6 South, Range 4 East;				
5. Then north along the west boundaries of Sections 34, 27, 22, 15, 10, and 3, Township 6 South, Range 4 East;				
6. Then west along the township line common to Township 5 South and Township 6 South;				
7. Then north along the range line common to Range 4 East and Range 3 East;				
8. Then west along the south boundaries of Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, Township 5 South, Range 3 East;				
9. Then north along the range line common to Range 2 East and Range 3 East to the Riverside-San Bernardino county line.				
San Bernardino County—that portion of San Bernardino County which lies south and west of a line described as follows:				
1. Beginning at the San Bernardino-Riverside County boundary and running north along the range line common to Range 3 East and Range 2 East, San Bernardino Base and Meridian;				
2. Then west along the township line common to Township 3 North and Township 2 North to the San Bernardino—Los Angeles County boundary.				
* * * * * * *				

[1] This date is November 15, 1990, unless otherwise noted.

[FR Doc. E7–8673 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 223

[Docket No. 070123015–7086–02; I.D. 031006D]

RIN 0648–AU43

Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determination for Puget Sound Steelhead

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We, NMFS, are issuing a final determination to list the distinct population segment (DPS) of steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in Puget Sound, Washington, as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). We intend to issue final protective regulations and propose critical habitat for this DPS in separate rulemakings.

DATES: The effective date of this rule is June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: NMFS, Protected Resources Division, 1201 NE Lloyd Boulevard, Suite 1100, Portland, OR 97232.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Stone, NMFS, Northwest Region, at (503) 231–2317; or Marta Nammack, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, at (301) 713 1401. Reference materials regarding these determinations are available upon request or on the Internet at *http://www.nwr.noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Steelhead Life History

Steelhead is the name commonly applied to the anadromous form of the biological species *O. mykiss*. The present distribution of steelhead extends from Kamchatka in Asia, east to Alaska, and south along the Pacific coast to the U.S.-Mexico border (Busby *et al.*, 1996; 67 FR 21586; May 1, 2002). *O. mykiss* exhibit the most complex life-history of any species of Pacific salmonid. *O. mykiss* can be anadromous (''steelhead'') or freshwater residents (''rainbow'' or ''redband'' trout), and under some circumstances, they can yield offspring of the alternate life-history form. Anadromous *O. mykiss* can spend up to 7 years in fresh water prior to smoltification (the physiological and behavioral changes required for the transition to salt water), and then spend up to 3 years in salt water prior to migrating back to their natal streams to spawn. *O. mykiss* may spawn more than once during their life span (iteroparous), whereas the Pacific salmon species generally spawn once and die (semelparous).

Within the range of West Coast steelhead, spawning migrations occur throughout the year, with seasonal peaks of activity. In a given river basin there may be one or more peaks in migration activity, and these ''runs'' are usually named for the season in which the peak occurs (e.g., winter, spring, summer, or fall steelhead). Steelhead can be divided into two basic reproductive ecotypes, based on the state of sexual maturity at the time of river entry and duration of spawning migration (Burgner *et al.*, 1992). The summer or ''stream-maturing'' type enters fresh water in a sexually immature condition between May and October, and requires several months to mature and spawn. The winter or ''ocean-maturing'' type enters fresh water between November and April with well-developed gonads and spawns shortly thereafter. In basins with both summer and winter steelhead runs, the summer run generally occurs where habitat is not fully utilized by the winter run, or where an ephemeral hydrologic barrier separates them, such as a seasonal velocity barrier at a waterfall. Summer steelhead usually spawn farther upstream than winter steelhead (Withler, 1966; Roelofs, 1983; Behnke, 1992).

The Puget Sound steelhead DPS includes more than 50 stocks of summer- and winter-run fish, the latter being the most widespread and numerous of the two run types (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), 2002). Hatchery steelhead production in Puget Sound is widespread and focused primarily on the propagation of winter-run fish derived from a stock of domesticated, mixed-origin steelhead (the Chambers Creek Hatchery stock) originally native to a small Puget Sound stream that is now extirpated from the wild. Hatchery summer-run steelhead are also produced in Puget Sound; these fish are derived from the Skamania River in the Columbia River Basin. The majority of hatchery stocks are not considered part of this DPS because they are more than moderately diverged from the local native populations (NMFS, 2005). Resident *O. mykiss* occur within the range of Puget Sound steelhead but are not part of the DPS due to marked differences in physical, physiological, ecological, and behavioral characteristics (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006).

Listing Determinations Under the ESA

We exercise ESA jurisdiction over most marine and anadromous fishes, and are responsible for determining whether West Coast salmon and steelhead warrant listing as threatened or endangered species under the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Section 3 of the ESA defines ''species'' as including ''any subspecies of fish or wildlife or plants, and any distinct population segment of any species of vertebrate fish or wildlife which interbreeds when mature.'' The term ''distinct population segment'' is not recognized in the scientific literature. On February 7, 1996, we and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service adopted a joint policy for recognizing DPSs under the ESA (DPS Policy; 61 FR 4722). As described in our proposed rule (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006), we apply the DPS policy in delineating species of West Coast *O. mykiss* for consideration under the ESA. The policy adopts criteria for determining when a group of vertebrates constitutes a DPS: the group must be discrete from other populations and it must be significant to its taxon. A group of organisms is discrete if it is ''markedly separated from other populations of the same taxon as a consequence of physical, physiological, ecological, and behavioral factors.'' Significance is evaluated with respect to the taxon (species or subspecies). See 70 FR 67132 (November 4, 2005; ''Proposed Evaluation of Significance under the DPS Policy''), and 71 FR 836 (January 5, 2006; ''*General Comments on the Consideration of Resident O. Mykiss: Determination of Species*'')

On June 28, 2005, we published a new policy for the consideration of hatchery-origin fish in ESA listing determinations (''Hatchery Listing Policy;'' 70 FR 37204). Under the Hatchery Listing Policy, hatchery stocks are considered part of a DPS if they exhibit a level of genetic divergence relative to the local natural population(s) that is no more than what occurs within the DPS (70 FR at 37215; June 28, 2005). If a DPS as a whole warrants listing as threatened or endangered, the hatchery stocks considered part of the DPS will be included in the listing determination.

The ESA requires us to determine whether any species is endangered or threatened because of any of the following five factors: (1) The present or threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of its habitat or range; (2)

overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (3) disease or predation; (4) the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or (5) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence (section 4(a)(1)(A)-(E)). The ESA defines an endangered species as one that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range, and a threatened species as one that is likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range. We are to make ESA listing determinations based solely on the best available scientific information after conducting a review of the status of the species and taking into account any efforts being made by states or foreign governments to protect the species.

When evaluating the ESA section 4(a)(1) factors we focus on whether and to what extent a given factor represents a threat to the future survival of the species. When we consider protective efforts we assess whether and to what extent they address the identified threats and so ameliorate a species' risk of extinction. The overall steps we follow in implementing this statutory scheme are to: (1) delineate the species under consideration; (2) review the status of the species; (3) consider the ESA section 4(a)(1) factors to identify threats facing the species; (4) assess whether certain protective efforts mitigate these threats; and (5) predict the species' future persistence.

As noted above, as part of our listing determinations we must consider efforts being made to protect a species, and whether these efforts ameliorate the threats facing the species and reduce risks to its survival. Some protective efforts may be fully implemented, and empirical information may be available demonstrating their level of effectiveness in conserving the species. Other protective efforts are new, not yet implemented, or have not demonstrated effectiveness. We evaluate such efforts using the criteria outlined in the Policy for Evaluating Conservation Efforts (''PECE''; 68 FR 15100; March 28, 2003) to determine their certainty of implementation and effectiveness.

Previous ESA Reviews and Findings

In 1996 we reviewed the status of West Coast steelhead. As part of this review we determined that steelhead in Puget Sound did not warrant listing under the ESA (61 FR 41541; August 9, 1996). Subsequently we received and accepted a petition to re-evaluate the status of Puget Sound steelhead (70 FR 17223; April 5, 2005). We reviewed the new information and on March 29, 2006, published a proposed rule to list the Puget Sound steelhead DPS as threatened under the ESA (71 FR 15666). The DPS was proposed to include all naturally spawned anadromous winter-run and summer-run steelhead populations, in streams in the river basins of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and Hood Canal, Washington, bounded to the west by the Elwha River (inclusive) and to the north by the Nooksack River and Dakota Creek (inclusive), as well as the Green River natural and Hamma Hamma winter-run steelhead hatchery stocks. This proposal was informed by the conclusions of scientists on the Biological Review Team (BRT) who assessed the overall viability of this DPS. Based on this assessment, the BRT concluded that Puget Sound steelhead are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all of their range. We also concluded that, at present, protective efforts in Puget Sound do not substantially mitigate the factors threatening the DPS's future viability, nor do they ameliorate the BRT's assessment of extinction risk. Additional details pertaining to these findings and the information reviewed for this DPS can be found in the documents cited above as well as agency status reviews (Busby *et al.*, 1996; NMFS, 2005).

On February 7, 2007 (72 FR 5648), we proposed to issue protective regulations for Puget Sound steelhead under section 4(d) of the ESA. For species listed as threatened, section 4(d) of the ESA requires the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to issue such regulations as are deemed necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of the species. Such 4(d) protective regulations may prohibit, with respect to threatened species, some or all of the acts that section 9(a) of the ESA prohibits with respect to endangered species. Both the section 9(a) prohibitions and section 4(d) regulations apply to all individuals, organizations, and agencies subject to U.S. jurisdiction. The 4(d) regulations we proposed are contingent on a final listing decision, and any finalized 4(d) rule may prohibit the take of Puget Sound steelhead except for specified categories of activities determined to be adequately protective of these fish.

Summary of Comments Received in Response to the Proposed Rule

We solicited public comment on the proposed listing of Puget Sound steelhead for a total of 238 days and held one public hearing in Seattle, Washington (71 FR 15666, March 29, 2006; 71 FR 28294, May 16, 2006). We also sought technical review of the scientific information underlying the proposed listing determination from seven independent experts. In response to the proposed listing we received over 30 comments by fax, standard mail, and e-mail. The majority of comments received were from interested individuals who submitted e-mails or letters. Comments were also submitted by federal, state and tribal natural resource agencies, fishing groups, environmental organizations, conservation organizations, and individuals with expertise in Pacific salmonids. The vast majority of respondents supported listing Puget Sound steelhead under the ESA. We also received comments from four of the independent experts from whom we had requested technical review of the scientific information underlying the March 2006 proposed listing determination. Copies of the full text of comments received are available upon request (see **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

Below we address the comments received that pertain to the listing determination for Puget Sound *steelhead*. The issues raised and our responses are organized into six general categories: (1) General Comments; (2) Comments on the Consideration of Hatchery Steelhead; (3) Comments on the Consideration of Resident *O. mykiss*; (4) Comments on the Assessment of Extinction Risk; (5) Comments on the Factors Affecting the Species; and (6) Comments on the Consideration of Protective Efforts/Mitigating Factors.

General Comments and Comments on Process

Comment 1: Most commenters supported listing Puget Sound steelhead under the ESA, and many expressed concern over the species' decline and the potential impacts of that decline on business and recreation. Some comments expressed concern over the fact that the current status review for Puget Sound steelhead was completed only 10 years after the previous review which found that a listing determination was not warranted.

Response: The BRT status review describes the various types of new information that are available since the review by Busby *et al.* (1996). In addition, there have been considerable scientific findings and policy development regarding the role of resident and hatchery *O. mykiss* in steelhead DPSs (see 70 FR 37204, June 28, 2005; 70 FR 67131, November 4, 2005; 71 FR 834, January 5, 2006). All of these considerations have been factored into this updated status review and support our determination that

Puget Sound steelhead now warrant listing as a threatened species under the ESA.

We recognize that steelhead are a prized gamefish in Puget Sound and that their decline has affected businesses and recreational pursuits. We will work with all stakeholders to help ensure that recovery planning proceeds apace so that Puget Sound steelhead continue to provide the spectrum of ecological, cultural, and economic benefits that underscore their status as the state fish of Washington.

Comment 2: Two commenters argued against listing steelhead at this time and instead recommended that we make a finding that listing is warranted but precluded or classify this DPS as a species of concern. One contended that because other ESA-listed species in Puget Sound (e.g., Chinook salmon) share habitat with this DPS, an additional listing in the region would add another layer of regulation with little resultant benefit to the species. Additionally, this commenter believed that listing steelhead would divert resources away from implementing a recovery plan for Chinook salmon.

Response: Our decision to list Puget Sound steelhead is based on the required assessments identified in section 4 of the ESA and guided by agency policies such as the PECE (68 FR 15100; March 28, 2003). Once a species has been proposed for listing, section 4(b)(6)(A) of the ESA does not allow us to issue a warranted but precluded finding. Such a finding is only permissible at the time of a proposed rule (see section 4(b)(3)(B)), not a final rule. Species of concern are those about which we have concerns regarding status and threats, but for which insufficient information is available to indicate a need to list the species under the ESA. This is not the case for Puget Sound steelhead, as evidenced by the findings of the BRT, and our assessment of the factors contributing to the decline of steelhead and efforts being made to protect the species.

We recognize that steelhead and threatened Puget Sound Chinook salmon share many streams and that actions benefitting one species would in many cases benefit the other. However, this fact did not alter our conclusions based upon our analysis of the threats facing West Coast steelhead under section 4(a)(1) of the ESA. Also, the species' overlap is not complete and there are a substantial number of independent streams, and upstream and tributary habitats in major river systems where only steelhead reside. In addition, steelhead use habitats differently and at different times than other salmonids. As noted elsewhere in this final rule, we expect that the recently adopted recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007) will accrue benefits to steelhead as well as expedite recovery planning for this DPS. Listing steelhead could divert some resources in the short term; however, comments and information received from WDFW, Indian tribes, and other co-managers and stakeholders have made it clear that there is a strong commitment to improving steelhead populations and their management in Puget Sound and statewide. We too are committed to helping find and provide the resources needed to help foster active recovery planning for all Puget Sound salmonids.

Comment 3: One commenter suggested that the final rule would be more useful if it used a different format addressing the DPS's historic condition, current status with respect to viable salmonid population (VSP) parameters (McElhany *et al.*, 2000), management action impacts (past and projected), and which management actions are needed to improve DPS viability. This commenter believed that this would provide a more accurate and informative discussion of issues that are fundamental to developing any eventual recovery plan.

Response: Because this final rule is a listing determination and not a recovery plan, we have chosen instead to structure this rule in a manner that is consistent with the statutory framework and previous ESA listing decisions for West Coast salmonids. However, in our listing analysis we have identified current threats to the species' viability and considered the efficacy of efforts being made to protect the species. This has given us and Puget Sound stakeholders, many of whom actively participated in developing the recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007), a head start on recovery planning for Puget Sound steelhead. We also understand that the watershed-based resource management plans for steelhead currently under development in Puget Sound (WDFW, 2007) will incorporate VSP parameters and provide the detail required to identify management actions needed to promote recovery of steelhead.

Comment 4: One commenter recommended that we solicit the views of the British Columbia Ministry of Environment.

Response: We notified the British Columbia Ministry of Environment of the proposed ESA listing of Puget Sound steelhead but did not receive comments or information from them. However, one of the peer reviewers of the BRT's status review is a fisheries scientist with British Columbia's Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection and an expert on steelhead biology.

Comment 5: One commenter felt that the proposed listing fails to fully consider the tribes' role as managers and overlooks the significant costs on tribal resource management agencies and harvest opportunities associated with listing Puget Sound steelhead under the ESA.

Response: We recognize that the tribes have longstanding cultural ties to steelhead and steelhead fisheries, and that a number of tribes have treaty-based co-management rights and responsibilities. And we acknowledge that steelhead are of economic importance to Indian people and embody cultural, ceremonial, and social dimensions of tribal life to the degree that the species is a significant symbol of tribal identity (NMFS, 2004). We also understand that an ESA listing of Puget Sound steelhead may impact some tribal fisheries and resource management agencies, at least in the short term. Steelhead recovery will only succeed with the active involvement of affected tribes. We will continue to recognize the tribes as vital co-managers of this important resource in the hope that steelhead runs can be restored as quickly as possible to meet treaty obligations and the needs of present and future generations.

Comment 6: A peer reviewer and several commenters expressed concern about the lack of reliable data for this DPS. Another commenter expressed concerns about the adequacy of the peer review process as well as the lack of a co-manager review of the BRT's report.

Response: While more data would help resolve some areas of uncertainty, we have sufficient data to assess the ESA status of Puget Sound steelhead. Moreover, as required by section 4(b)(1)(A) of the ESA, we have relied on the best scientific and commercial data available to make this listing determination. We requested and received such data from a variety of interested parties, including state and tribal co-managers. These data and other information are cited in this final rule, agency status reviews (Busby *et al.*, 1996; NMFS, 2005), our proposed rule (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006), and in the comments received on the latter and contained in our agency files (available for public inspection; see **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

Several of the 13 BRT members are acknowledged experts on steelhead

biology in the Pacific Northwest, some with direct experience with the species in Puget Sound. As noted elsewhere in this final rule, we sought technical review of the scientific information underlying the March 2006 proposed listing determination from seven independent experts. All of the experts were selected based on their knowledge of steelhead biology. Four of them provided us with comments that were subsequently considered by the BRT and reflected in the agency's status review (NMFS, 2005). We also received and evaluated information from state and tribal co-managers on the proposed rule and the BRT's report.

Comment 7: Several commenters requested that NMFS re-open the public comment period after WDFW publishes an anticipated white paper pertaining to steelhead management. These commenters felt that the public should have the opportunity to review WDFW's management plan to determine what effect, if any, it may have on the extinction risks to Puget Sound steelhead and the NMFS listing of the DPS.

Response: On August 25, 2006, we received a letter from WDFW requesting our review of a July 21, 2006, draft report titled ''Oncorhynchus mykiss: Assessment of Washington State's Anadromous Populations and Programs'' (WDFW, 2006a). This report--commonly referred to as the steelhead ''white paper≥--was also made available to the general public for comment. We provided comments to WDFW on this report, noting that overall we found it to be a very comprehensive and useful compilation of what is known about the biology and management histories of Washington's steelhead populations. However, we did not believe that the availability of this report warranted re-opening the comment period on our proposed listing because the report was essentially a synthesis of what is known (much of which we had already reviewed) about Washington steelhead. In addition, the report was primarily designed to lay the foundation for the development of improved management plans.

In our proposed rule we stated that ''[i]f WDFW completes its new steelhead management plan prior to the publication of the final rule we anticipate considering it in developing our final listing determination.'' However, a final Puget Sound steelhead management plan has not yet been developed.

Comment 8: One letter requested clarification of named populations in the 2005 status review (i.e., if references to the Lake Washington winter run include steelhead in the Cedar River).

Response: Population information on Lake Washington winter run steelhead was provided by WDFW. Lake Washington steelhead data included information on fish spawning in the Cedar River, Issaquah Creek, and Bear Creek, with the Cedar River contribution providing the majority of the escapement (number of adults that return to the spawning grounds). The BRT also reviewed fish passage information from the Lake Washington Ship Canal fish ladder, which would include fish spawning throughout the basin. The WDFW Salmonid Stock Inventory database identifies a number of tributaries, including the Cedar River, in the Lake Washington Basin where spawning steelhead have been observed.

Comment 9: One letter requested clarification of the location of ''impassible barriers'' and suggested the definition include an approximate location.

Response: In our status review (NMFS, 2005) we identified some of the major natural and manmade barriers to steelhead (e.g., Snoqualmie Falls and Elwha Dam), emphasizing the general role that longstanding barriers play in isolating the anadromous and resident life forms. During our review it was not possible to identify the specific locations of all impassable barriers, in particular natural waterfalls and velocity/stream gradient barriers. Our biologists (see ADDRESSES) or those from the tribes or state and Federal agencies can assist in determining whether a specific barrier is passable or not.

Comment 10: One commenter noted that fish passage above Landsburg dam became possible in September 2003, not 2002 as stated in the BRT's report (NMFS, 2005).

Response: The statement in the BRT report should have stated that ''Most of the information relevant to this question is from the Cedar River, where research is ongoing on resident and anadromous fish below and above Landsburg Dam, opened to steelhead migrating upstream in 2003, after decades of isolation.''

Comment 11: We received one correction comment, to add the South Fork Tolt River to the list of rivers under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission agreement for instream flow management.

Response: The statement in the proposed rule (at 71 FR 15677; March 29, 2006) should have read, ''Instream flows are also provided through agreements negotiated with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on the Skagit, Sultan, Snoqualmie, South Fork Tolt, and Nisqually rivers.''

Comment 12: A few commenters provided comments and information relevant to making a critical habitat designation for Puget Sound steelhead.

Response: We will consider this information as we prepare a proposal to designate critical habitat for this DPS.

Comments on the Consideration of Hatchery Steelhead

Comment 13: Several commenters expressed strong concerns about the negative impacts of hatchery steelhead in this DPS, urging that much more aggressive steps be taken to reduce these impacts. Some commenters disagreed with the decision to include Green River natural and Hamma Hamma winter-run hatchery steelhead in the DPS. They argued that protecting hatchery steelhead under the ESA by listing them alongside wild steelhead was inappropriate, particularly because research suggests that hatchery fish have a negative impact on the productivity of wild steelhead. In contrast, one commenter recommended hatchery steelhead be included in the DPS if they are derived from a local wild stock.

Response: On June 28, 2005, we finalized a new policy for the consideration of hatchery-origin fish in ESA listing determinations (''Hatchery Listing Policy;'' 70 FR 37204). Under the Hatchery Listing Policy hatchery stocks are considered part of an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) if they exhibit a level of genetic divergence relative to the local natural population(s) that is no more than what occurs within the ESU (70 FR 37204; June 28, 2005, at 37215). The considerations that informed the Hatchery Listing Policy for ESUs are equally valid for steelhead DPSs. We acknowledge that hatchery fish can have a negative impact on naturally-produced fish, and in our proposed rule we noted that adverse impacts from hatchery programs may be contributing to the declines in natural steelhead productivity. However, the Hatchery Listing Policy is based in part on the recognition that important components of the evolutionary legacy of West Coast salmon and steelhead can be found in hatchery stocks, and that many hatchery stocks are derived from, and not significantly diverged from, the naturally spawning stocks. We developed a test for including hatchery stocks in an ESU based upon a consideration of ''whether a particular hatchery stock reflects an ESU's 'reproductive isolation' and 'evolutionary legacy''' (70 FR 37204; June 28, 2005, at 37208). Those tests are equally applicable to determining

whether hatchery stocks reflect the discreteness and significance of steelhead DPSs.

As described in our proposed rule and consistent with recent final listing determinations for 16 West Coast salmon ESUs (70 FR 37160; June 28, 2005) and for 10 West Coast steelhead DPSs (71 FR 834; January 5, 2006), we believe it is appropriate to list two locally-derived hatchery steelhead populations (Green River natural and Hamma Hamma winter-run) along with naturally-produced steelhead in the Puget Sound DPS. This decision is informed by our Hatchery Listing Policy, the conclusions of the Salmon/Steelhead Hatchery Assessment Group (SSHAG; NMFS, 2005), and the deliberations of the BRT. The BRT concluded that these hatchery stocks meet the Hatchery Listing Policy's test for inclusion in the DPS.

As a separate matter, the BRT also explicitly considered both the potential positive and negative effects of hatchery production on the viability of Puget Sound steelhead. The BRT felt that the Green River natural and Hamma Hamma winter-run hatchery programs have the potential to benefit natural steelhead populations in their respective rivers, but acknowledged that both programs are relatively recent and have not collected sufficient data to demonstrate any contributions with any certainty. The BRT did note that the Hamma Hamma program does appear to have successfully increased the number of natural spawners in the population (although the relative increase in natural spawners is large, the absolute increase in natural spawners is modest), but the success of the program cannot be fully evaluated until the naturally produced offspring of the hatchery-origin fish return and reproduce.

Comment 14: Several commenters contended that past and present harvest and hatchery management have essentially eliminated the important early returning life-history component of wild steelhead populations in this DPS. They argue that, despite WDFW's intent to temporally separate the hatchery run from the wild run, data demonstrate that hatchery males overwinter, residualize (remain in fresh water), and ultimately breed with wild females. This commenter contended that we failed to adequately evaluate the association of steelhead hatchery programs with overutilization of Puget Sound steelhead. This commenter believed that any evaluation of the risks of adverse genetic and ecological impacts from hatchery programs on the distribution, productivity, and diversity of Puget Sound steelhead should be made in the context of that fundamental relationship between hatchery management and overutilization.

Response: There is some information available on the historical return and spawn timing of Puget Sound steelhead, but it is limited to catch records and anecdotal information. The BRT was unaware of any documentation suggesting a spawning habitat preference exhibited by the early component of the winter run. The BRT was concerned about the decline (or elimination) of this early component to life history diversity, but was unable to establish the magnitude of this loss.

The existence of an early run component of naturally-produced steelhead was discussed by the BRT in relation to the effects of a directed harvest of early run, mass-marked (adipose-clipped) hatchery steelhead (i.e., Chamber's Creek winter run). The BRT reviewed information on hatchery-wild interactions, specifically the potential for interbreeding between hatchery and naturally-produced fish in Washington coastal streams. This information was important in the BRT's increased concern about hatchery effects relative to the 1996 BRT Status Review (Busby *et al.*, 1996).

Comment 15: One commenter questioned the assertion that the Chambers Creek hatchery stock is out-of-basin for all waterways in the DPS. This commenter pointed out that originally, the Chambers Creek stock was a composite of wild fish trapped from a variety of Puget Sound rivers, including the Green River. Therefore, Chambers Creek hatchery fish may not be out-of-basin for all waterways, such as the south sound rivers. The commenter requested that NMFS clarify how much composite stock or hatchery selection is necessary for a stock to change to the point of being considered out-of-basin.

Response: The commenter is correct that the Chambers Creek hatchery stock (actually several broodstocks derived from the original Chambers Creek broodstock) is technically not an ''out-of-basin'' stock. Crawford (1979) reviews the history of this stock, including the evolution of the Chambers Creek and ''egg bank'' steelhead program. But this does not change our conclusion that it has sufficiently diverged from the remainder of the DPS such that it should no longer be considered part of this DPS. The BRT reviewed the findings of the SSHAG (NMFS, 2005) for this broodstock and noted that the intentional and unintentional selection of life history traits was a major factor in the SSHAG evaluation. The advancement in run- and spawn-timing of the Chambers Creek winter-run steelhead (almost 2 months) and acceleration of the onset of smoltification (1 year instead of 2 years) have dramatically altered the reproductive connectivity between the hatchery-origin and naturally-spawning adults. Additionally, the sole use of hatchery-origin fish for hatchery broodstocks greatly increases the potential for hatchery domestication, and there is evidence that Chambers Creek winter-run steelhead have a poor rate of natural spawning success (NMFS, 2005).

Given the paucity of information on hatchery steelhead life-history traits in the natural environment and their fitness effects on naturally-spawning populations, it is not possible to ''quantify'' a threshold for exclusion. This is why we convened a SSHAG to review the best available information and provide us with conclusions regarding the relationship of hatchery fish to DPS composition and viability.

Comment 16: Several commenters raised questions about the origin of steelhead currently spawning naturally in the Lake Washington system, particularly the Cedar River and Sammamish watershed. Some of these commenters believe that steelhead currently spawning naturally in this system are derived from Chambers Creek hatchery plants and not naturally spawning fish native to this system.

Response: Genetic analysis by Marshall *et al.* (2006) on resident and anadromous *O. mykiss* in Lake Washington indicates that there are significant genetic differences between native Cedar River fish and Chambers Creek-derived hatchery winter steelhead. We therefore consider the naturally spawning populations in this system to be part of the Puget Sound DPS.

In their review, the BRT cautioned that although WDFW's conclusion that there is little overlap in spawning between natural and hatchery stocks of winter steelhead throughout the ESU is generally supported by available evidence, for many basins it is based largely on models and assumptions regarding run timing rather than on empirical data.

Comment 17: One commenter provided information correlating increasing hatchery smolt releases with declining adult returns, suggesting a ''density barrier'' to population expansion. This commenter also expressed concerns about hatchery smolts remaining in fresh water rather than migrating to the ocean (residualizing), and preying upon or spawning with natural steelhead

(particularly by residual precocious males). Another commenter echoed many of these concerns related to the release of millions of hatchery fish into this DPS, and one believed that we should have given greater attention to this issue in the status review and requested that at a minimum we do so in the final listing determination.

Response: The BRT expressed concerned about the increasing numbers and overall proportion of hatchery-origin smolts released into rivers in this DPS; however, there is not sufficient information on behavioral and resource competition, predation, or other ecological interactions to assess the ''density barrier'' assertion. Factors such as declining freshwater, estuarine, and marine productivity would independently or in combination with hatchery effects produce the same effect. The myriad of factors that could produce the trends observed make it very difficult to associate correlated responses with causal factors. We will continue to address issues related to artificial propagation as we proceed with ESA consultations, permitting, and recovery planning in Puget Sound.

Comments on the Consideration of Resident O. mykiss

Comment 18: Several commenters disagreed with our application of the DPS Policy criteria in separating the resident and anadromous forms of *O. mykiss* in this DPS. One commenter cited the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (FWS) listing of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*; 64 FR 58910, November 1, 1999) as precedent for listing together the different life history forms because all are essential to the survival of the DPS. Another commenter felt resident fish should be considered in the context of protective measures for steelhead. Other commenters supported the listing of the two life forms separately, but encouraged further research to increase our understanding of the interactions between the two. These latter commenters encouraged NMFS to consider the relationship between resident and anadromous *O. mykiss* in the course of other ESA activities (e.g., recovery planning).

Response: In our recently updated listing determinations for West Coast steelhead (71 FR 834; January 5, 2006), we responded to similar comments regarding our application of the DPS policy in delineating ''species'' of *O. mykiss* under the ESA. The reader is referred to these determinations (see 71 FR 834; January 5, 2006, at 836 through 841) for more detailed information and discussion of the above and other issues relating to our delineation of steelhead DPSs.

NMFS did not include resident and anadromous *O. mykiss* in the same DPS because under the DPS policy, a population or group of populations is considered a DPS if it is first ''discrete'' from other such population units, and then only if it is ''significant'' to the taxon as a whole. Whether a given life form contributes to the viability of the species does not necessarily determine whether that life form is ''markedly separated'' from other components of the species. For example, a subspecies will often contribute significantly to the overall viability of a species but still be markedly separated from other subspecies.

In its 1999 listing determination for the Coastal-Puget Sound bull trout DPS (64 FR 58910; November 1, 1999) the U.S. Department of the Interior found that the resident, migratory, anadromous, amphidromous, fluvial, and adfluvial life-history forms were not discrete because they interbreed. DOI concluded, as the commenter asserts, that reproductive exchange and genetic similarity between different life-history forms requires that they be included as parts of the same DPS, regardless of any ''marked separation'' in phenotypic traits. While we acknowledge that the expression of a range of life histories in bull trout and other fish species (e.g., coastal cutthroat trout) may raise similar issues to those we confronted in delineating DPSs of *O. mykiss*, there are important differences between *O. mykiss* and these other species. In addition to expressing anadromy (the life-history pattern in which fish spend a large portion of their life cycle in the ocean and return to fresh water to breed), bull trout and coastal cutthroat trout express amphidromy (migration between fresh and salt water that is for feeding and overwintering, as well as breeding). While the anadromous and resident forms of *O. mykiss* differ clearly in ocean-migratory behavior and associated biological factors, the migratory behavior and associated physical, physiological, and ecological factors are comparatively blurred among the life-history forms and stages of bull trout and coastal cutthroat trout. Accordingly, application of the DPS policy to these various species may very well produce different results due to the varying level of separation among their life-history forms.

Efforts to protect resident *O. mykiss* could be considered in the context of efforts being made to protect the species, because the health of related resident *O. mykiss* populations may have a bearing on the viability of the anadromous populations. No information was presented, however, that would lead us to conclude that any protective efforts for rainbow trout are likely to change the steelhead DPS's risk of extinction.

It is essential to improve our understanding of the interactions between the anadromous and resident life-history forms of *O. mykiss*. Additional scientific research could elucidate the factors affecting reproductive exchange between the two life forms, as well as their respective contributions to the viability of *O. mykiss* as a whole. These considerations may prove to be important in the context of recovery planning and assessing risks faced by the *O. mykiss* species as a whole. At present, there is insufficient information to evaluate whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent the resident form may contribute to the viability of steelhead over the long term (NMFS, 2005; Recovery Science Review Panel, 2004; Good *et al.*, 2005; Independent Scientific Advisory Board, 2005).

Comment 19: One letter commented on the BRT's statement that rivers west of the Cascades rarely support resident rainbow trout populations unless the watersheds have been significantly modified, and resident native populations appear to be relatively rare above natural barriers. This commenter argued that rainbow trout are present in many rivers west of the Cascade Mountains in those areas where the anadromous life history form is not dominant, including the upper Skagit River tributaries and the upper Snoqualmie River. One commenter felt it might be appropriate to add a discussion of the unique adfluvial (migrating between lakes and streams) life history pattern of a portion of the Cedar River *O. mykiss*.

Response: Rainbow trout are present in some of these western Washington systems, but they are rare above natural barriers to anadromous migration. Although there is potential for resident trout to function in a temporary manner to help maintain *O. mykiss* populations through extreme periods of low marine survival, this life history form is unlikely to maintain connections to other populations a critical role for the anadromous life history in contributing to the ESU's diversity and viability. Evidence for the level of interbreeding between resident and anadromous forms is limited and appears to vary considerably between coastal and inland *O. mykiss* populations, as well as on a basin by basin basis.

It is possible that this interaction may provide a short-term demographic

resiliency, although loss of the anadromous form would result in a catastrophic decline in diversity, and probably also spatial structure. Ultimately, the BRT's task was assessing the longer term risk of extinction facing Puget Sound steelhead, and to accomplish this task it focused on the primary data available: trends in abundance and productivity of anadromous fish. Although the *O. mykiss* life history appears to be extraordinarily plastic, and resident and anadromous fish both may produce the alternate life history form, the extent to which resident fish produce anadromous adults is largely unknown. In addition, the freshwater ''trout niche'' in Puget Sound is already occupied primarily by native coastal cutthroat trout, and the extent that resident *O. mykiss* alone can maintain self-sustaining natural populations in direct competition with cutthroat trout is unknown.

The adfluvial life form in the Cedar River appears to be somewhat unique to Puget Sound, and may be related to the highly modified nature of the river basin, especially its redirection into Lake Washington from the Green River Basin and the longstanding effects of Landsburg Dam in dividing the watershed.

Comments on the Assessment of Extinction Risk

Comment 20: Most commenters supported a listing of Puget Sound steelhead as a threatened species, although one recommended endangered status due to concerns about efforts being made to protect the species. One commenter provided data for five steelhead populations that indicate the largest populations of winter-run steelhead have experienced a period of pronounced decline in abundance, recruitment, and productivity beginning around 1989 and continuing to the present. One commenter suspected that the declines are likely to be DPS-wide. This commenter expressed concern that there is no information on the productivity of summer populations within the DPS and that this lack of information supports an endangered listing.

Response: We have reviewed the comments and new information provided by commenters and believe that Puget Sound steelhead do warrant listing as a threatened species. The BRT was presented with information received during the comment period and concluded that there was no basis for changing their conclusion that Puget Sound steelhead are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all of their range. Nor was the BRT aware of any new or forthcoming information that would warrant a reassessment of this conclusion. Consistent with the commenter's concern about DPS-wide declines, we note that the BRT stated that ''marked declines in natural run size are evident in all areas a pattern that reflects widespread reduced productivity of natural steelhead'' (NMFS, 2005).

Comment 21: A peer reviewer noted that the BRT's risk assessment was based on expert opinion due to the lack of sufficient empirical data. This reviewer noted that such data constraints limit the review and its veracity but acknowledged that the BRT's methods cannot be faulted. He noted that several times ''there was the mention of negative impact of hatchery fish on wild, and that hatchery fish have apparently made no contribution to wild adult returns. I suspect this is largely speculation, albeit accurate in my view.'' He also made several specific recommendations: (1) Explaining how data were obtained and any uncertainties with the data; (2) including an analysis from WDFW's Snow Creek studies (especially with respect to post-smolt migration pathways); (3) including the cited report by Light (1987) in the references; (4) evaluating cutthroat hybridization with steelhead; and (5) including an assessment of how climate change may affect Puget Sound steelhead. The latter recommendation was also made by another commenter, noting that the decline in steelhead abundance has coincided with a period of high hydrological variability during which fish are vulnerable to closely timed high and low flow events.

Response: The BRT relied heavily on catch and escapement data provided by WDFW for its risk analyses; this information constitutes the best available data, but there is still considerable uncertainty in the data, particularly for some populations.

The commenter is correct that our knowledge regarding the contribution of hatchery fish to natural steelhead reproduction in Puget Sound is limited. The conclusion that hatchery programs threaten the viability of Puget Sound steelhead is based on several steelhead studies in the Pacific Northwest published between 1977 and 2007, all of which show a depression in the reproductive performance of domesticated or out-of-basin hatchery steelhead spawning in the wild. The BRT concluded that efforts by hatchery managers to prevent natural spawning by Chambers Creek winter-run and Skamania summer-run hatchery fish were unlikely to be completely effective, with potentially adverse consequences. The BRT concluded that opportunities for genetic and ecological interactions between hatchery and wild steelhead in Puget Sound were substantial, with significant potential to reduce natural productivity. Moreover, the fixed March 15 threshold used by WDFW to separate spawning censuses of hatchery and wild fish confounds evaluations of those potential hatchery fish effects (i.e., spawning hatchery and wild fish may overlap later than that date), thus increasing scientific uncertainties. Until studies more clearly identify the effects of interbreeding between hatchery and wild steelhead, prudent management would reduce the opportunity for interaction between hatchery and wild fish (e.g., by eliminating ''outplanting'' and by using hatchery broodstocks genetically and phenotypically similar to local wild fish).

Available research on Snow Creek winter-run steelhead represents one of Puget Sound's longest term, watershed-scale studies on this species. However, the BRT did not formally include Snow Creek winter-run steelhead in its analysis of DPS risk because this population exhibits some sharp differences from other steelhead on the Olympic Peninsula and Puget Sound. The BRT concluded that the Snow Creek system is not representative of the level of human development seen in many other Puget Sound streams. The watershed enters Discovery Bay, an eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca tributary, so steelhead do not have to pass through a long fjord on their way to and from their freshwater home as do other Puget Sound stocks. There is some development along Snow Creek (including one of the most extensive clear-cuts in Washington state), but the stream lacks the urban and industrial changes seen in many other areas. Additionally, Snow Creek is a relatively small lowland watershed, lacking many of the features and species interactions found in larger river basins. Based on these differences, the BRT members were reluctant to extrapolate trends in the Snow Creek steelhead population to those of southern Puget Sound, for example. The BRT examined Snow Creek steelhead abundance data to evaluate their patterns relative to other Puget Sound steelhead trends, and it appears that the recent trend in abundance of Snow Creek steelhead is similar to that observed for several Puget Sound steelhead populations, including some surrounding populations from the Strait of Juan de

Fuca; Snow Creek steelhead show a recent sharp decline in adult abundance with a very recent modest upswing.

The BRT discussed rainbow/steelhead and cutthroat hybridization in its review. Although specific areas with relatively high incidences of hybrid fish have been identified, it is unclear how extensive this occurrence is. Additionally, in the absence of a historical baseline, it is unclear if the hybridization observed represents a natural process or one that is influenced by anthropogenic activities such as fish introductions or habitat disturbances. This topic is in need of concerted research before an evaluation in the listing context would be meaningful.

The BRT did not specifically evaluate how climate change might affect Puget Sound steelhead because such an evaluation would be highly speculative given the state of available evidence. In the proposed rule, we acknowledged that variability in ocean and freshwater conditions can have profound impacts on the productivity of salmon and steelhead populations. Natural climatic conditions have at different times exacerbated or mitigated the problems associated with degraded and altered riverine and estuarine habitats. We conclude that ocean-climate change and variability is a factor contributing considerable uncertainty to the viability of the Puget Sound steelhead DPS into the foreseeable future.

Comment 22: One commenter presented findings indicating that populations in the Skagit and Snohomish have a low risk of extinction. This commenter contended that winter-run steelhead in the Skagit, Snohomish-Skykomish, Pilchuck, Snoqualmie, and Green rivers and Morse Creek and other Strait of Juan de Fuca streams had a relatively low risk of extinction (WDFW, 2006b).

Response: The BRT did not find that extinction risk was high in the Skagit and Snohomish River winter-run populations; what the BRT found was that abundance had declined significantly in both since the 1996 review and that declining trends were evident in recent years. This pattern contrasted with that evidence in the previous review of steelhead in Puget Sound (Busby *et al.*, 1996), and was cause for concern among all BRT members. The other populations mentioned are small and therefore vulnerable to unpredictable events, even though their risk of imminent extinction is also probably low. The BRT based its conclusion about extinction risk for Puget Sound steelhead primarily on: (1) The widespread declines in adult abundance (total run size), despite significant reductions in harvest in recent years (strongly implying declining productivity of naturally spawning steelhead); (2) the threats to diversity posed by use of two hatchery stocks of steelhead inconsistent with wild stock diversity throughout the DPS; (3) the declining diversity in the DPS, including the uncertain but weak status of summer-run fish in the DPS; and (4) a reduction in spatial structure for steelhead in the DPS. The most striking difference in the BRT and WDFW reviews was the use of total run size by the BRT and escapement by WDFW. NMFS believes that by not including harvest, the WDFW analysis masks declines in overall productivity. The lack of a recent resurgence in abundance of Puget Sound steelhead since ocean conditions in the region have generally improved and since harvest rates have declined are key to understanding the factors that limit steelhead productivity in this DPS.

Comment 23: One commenter questioned our analysis of abundance trends for Puget Sound steelhead, noting that it differed from recent analyses by WDFW (in particular for the Skagit River) (WDFW, 2006a; WDFW, 2006b). Several other commenters expressed concern that WDFW's computed escapement goals were too low and ignored historical records indicating that some streams supported considerably larger runs of steelhead. Two commenters believed that the historical run size of Puget Sound steelhead may have been twice that estimated by the BRT.

Response: The BRT's risk assessment was based primarily on total run size, not escapement. The BRT believes that trends in run size are a better indicator of productivity and abundance of naturally reproducing fish; in addition, run size trends are independent of any changes in WDFW's escapement goals for Puget Sound steelhead populations.

With a few exceptions, there was little information that the BRT could use to develop statistical trends in abundance. A form of population viability analysis was provided by one commenter to the BRT for five of the largest steelhead populations in Puget Sound. This was possible because relatively complete adult abundance data (in the form of expanded redd counts) and age structure were known for these populations. The BRT reviewed these analyses and concluded that they were useful in corroborating additional analyses of trends in productivity and abundance. The BRT also concluded that the utility of this approach was limited by the use of an average age structure taken from historical data to estimate recruits and by failing to account for errors in estimates of spawner abundance. Concerns regarding the use of an average age structure in evaluating recruitment relationships may be relatively minimal compared to other factors, but the BRT felt that the fact that this age structure is based on much older data than the spawner-recruit time series may impose undue bias on the analyses. Although the run size and escapement data used in the commenter's analysis for the five populations were recent (through 2001–2003, depending on the population), the age structures were not. The age structure data were obtained from scales and tags recovered in the late 1980s and early 1990s, a period not coincident with the abundance data. Failing to account for temporal variability in age structure can bias estimates of productivity by overestimating recruitment in small cohorts and underestimating recruitment in large cohorts. Furthermore, and more importantly, the errors surrounding the estimates of spawner abundance remain unknown (but are probably quite high, e.g., the proportion of redds dug by hatchery-origin steelhead). Thus, the BRT concluded that the commenter's analysis had significant limitations. In its own analysis, the BRT could not avoid all these sources of bias but tried to minimize them by basing calculations on empirical age structure distributions that varied over time, where they were available, and identifying where this was not possible.

The BRT also noted that the fit of the stock-recruit data in the commenter's analysis was not evaluated quantitatively, and the BRT therefore attempted to fit these data to alternative models. In general, the fit of the data to either Ricker or Beverton-Holt stock-recruit models was very poor; for each of the five populations, a simple density-independent model such as the random-walk model with trend provided fits equally as good. Nevertheless, the fits to the random-walk model with trend were also poor.

The BRT therefore used several analyses to look for emergent patterns in the abundance and productivity trends, including estimates of trend, population growth rates, and estimates of recruits per spawner. Analysis of population growth rates does not account for density dependent productivity; however, the BRT's ability to detect such factors with the available data was limited because of the scientific uncertainties and assumptions associated with the spawner-recruit relationships. Nevertheless, the conclusions drawn from the BRT's

analyses were remarkably similar to those drawn from the commenter's analyses, despite limitations in the methods of both of them. Both the BRT and commenter's analyses express concern over low abundance and eroding productivity in even the largest and most robust populations in the DPS.

Any effort to model future population trends should account for recurring cyclic effects (such as ocean productivity cycles caused by decadal oscillations and marine upwelling) and long-term trends (such as freshwater habitat changes). The available data do not allow us to identify and partition these types of effects, which led the BRT to employ the more conservative approach of not assuming population improvements as a result of potential future cyclic improvements in ocean productivity.

Historical estimates of Puget Sound steelhead run size were based on expansions of commercial harvest (in pounds or fish) in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Given the uncertainties in estimating the catch, fishing effort, and historical average size, it is not surprising that there would be substantial differences in estimates. Nevertheless, estimates derived by the BRT and those submitted by the commenters indicate that there has been a substantial decline in the abundance of naturally-produced steelhead in the last 100 years.

Comment 24: One commenter requested that we clarify our use of the term ''viability'' as it pertains to salmonids.

Response: As described in McElhany *et al.* (2000), a viable salmonid population is an independent population of any Pacific salmonid (genus Oncorhynchus) that has a negligible risk of extinction due to threats from demographic variation (random or directional), local environmental variation, and genetic diversity changes (random or directional) over a 100–year time frame.

Comment 25: One commenter presented findings indicating that the number of winter steelhead spawners was above the state's management goal in 67 percent of the watersheds assessed, the number of winter steelhead spawners had or were expected to increase relative to the review by Busby *et al.* (1996), or a substantial number of resident *O. mykiss* were present. In contrast, other commenters believed that state management goals for steelhead had been set too low and would suggest that Puget Sound steelhead are healthier than they really are. Two commenters addressed the spatial distribution of steelhead and one of these contended that the percentage of the historical habitat occupied by the Puget Sound steelhead DPS is consistent with other non-listed DPSs.

Response: We have not reviewed in detail the state's management goals for winter steelhead and cannot assess whether the levels are appropriate to ensure the long-term viability of the DPS. Such a review should also consider summer steelhead and will need to occur in partnership with our state and tribal co-managers during ESA consultations and permitting reviews, and with all interested stakeholders during recovery planning. We do note that more than half of the watersheds identified as above management goals for winter steelhead have relatively small runs, each averaging 102 fish or less from 2002–2005 (WDFW, 2006b). We also note that the BRT did express concerns over reductions in escapement goals for steelhead runs in several watersheds, including the relatively large run in the Skagit River.

The BRT reviewed the most recent abundance data for 2005 and the projections for 2006 (WDFW, 2006b). These data, which were not available prior to our proposed rule, indicate that winter steelhead abundance in 2005 was actually lower than the 2004 estimates in every watershed reviewed. Moreover, in all but one watershed, the 2006 projections are also lower than the 1991–1994 average abundance considered in our earlier status review (Busby *et al.*, 1996). These data do not suggest a lessening of abundance-related risk for this DPS.

The evidence for a substantial number of resident fish appears to be restricted to a single watershed (Lake Washington). As noted in a previous response, there is insufficient information to evaluate whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent the resident form may contribute to the viability of steelhead over the long term. Additional scientific research is needed to more fully understand the roles and interactions of the anadromous and resident life forms.

The percentage of historical habitat still occupied by Puget Sound steelhead is one of many parameters that we considered in making this final listing determination. While the data referenced by one commenter (WDFW, 2006a) suggest that this percentage is high relative to other ESA-listed DPSs, the data also indicate that watersheds with some of the highest production potential (e.g., the Skagit River and Green/Duwamish River) have potentially suffered the greatest loss in habitat. In addition, these data do not reveal the related and significant decline in the quality of remaining habitat highlighted by the BRT (NMFS, 2005) and in our proposed rule (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006).

Comments on the Factors Affecting the Species

Comment 26: Several commenters agreed with our determination that habitat loss is a principal factor limiting the viability of the DPS. One commenter believed that we failed to focus on habitat limiting factors particular to steelhead (e.g., susceptibilities during extended freshwater rearing) and believed that degraded habitat exerts the greatest influence on steelhead survival. Other commenters believed that we provided a superficial treatment of the biological and demographic conditions of the DPS and as a result presented a poorly grounded conclusion that habitat modification and destruction is the principal limiting factor for Puget Sound steelhead. One commenter believed that some habitat restoration efforts are misguided (e.g., large woody debris placement) and actually damage the river channel.

Response: We believe that we have accurately portrayed the role that habitat loss and modification have played in the decline of this DPS. Habitat issues were discussed at length by the BRT, and several of the 13 BRT members (including scientists from four Federal agencies) have extensive knowledge working with steelhead habitat issues in Puget Sound. We also base our assessment on more than 8 years of consultations for other ESA-listed species, namely Chinook and summer-run chum salmon, that share many habitat areas with Puget Sound steelhead. The vast majority of our ESA consultations involve evaluating actions that affect salmonid habitat. We have also been actively engaged in the development of numerous ESA habitat conservation plans affecting dozens of Puget Sound watersheds and have played a significant role in the development and recent adoption of a recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook. We will address issues specific to steelhead as we continue working with these stakeholders and co-managers to determine what if any changes are needed to actions that modify salmonid habitat (including restoration efforts).

Comment 27: Two commenters did not agree with our assessment regarding the overutilization of Puget Sound steelhead for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes. They believed that overutilization likely is a factor limiting the viability of this DPS and argued that even low mortality

from harvest could continue to limit the viability of the DPS. One took exception to the BRT report's characterization that the Skagit River escapement goal was recently lowered to ''support harvest'' and was cited as one of the reasons for the proposed listing.

Response: We did not receive new information to support a change in our conclusion that overutilization for recreational purposes was a factor that contributed to the past decline of Puget Sound steelhead populations but is not believed to be a primary factor limiting the viability of the Puget Sound steelhead DPS into the foreseeable future. We will, however, actively consult with state and tribal co-managers under the ESA and review harvest and associated hatchery strategies for this DPS to ensure that they do not jeopardize its continued existence.

The BRT acknowledged that questions regarding carrying capacity were a primary impetus for co-managers to reduce the escapement goals in the Skagit River basin. The BRT's statement reflects a general concern by the BRT that the Skagit River (one of the largest producers of steelhead in Puget Sound) may be subjected to reduced escapements at a time when the basin's abundance is much reduced from the past.

Comment 28: We received a number of comments regarding the role of tribal netting in the overutilization of steelhead in Puget Sound. These commenters felt that tribal fishing is an important aspect of overutilization of the DPS and needs either greater oversight or a complete moratorium in order to protect steelhead populations. One commenter argued that tribal fishing is not monitored enough by authorities and so take numbers are higher than what is allowed.

Response: We have not received information that would lead us to the conclusion that tribal fisheries overutilize Puget Sound steelhead. A number of Puget Sound tribes have federally-recognized treaty rights to fish for steelhead, and in most areas their fisheries target hatchery fish. The tribes in many cases have curtailed their fisheries or refrained from fishing to conserve salmon and steelhead. We will continue working with the tribes to address harvest and other issues that affect the long-term viability of Puget Sound steelhead and treaty-based fisheries.

Comment 29: NMFS received several comments disagreeing with the assertion that disease and predation are not factors limiting the viability of the DPS. Commenters felt that this issue deserves greater research and requested that NMFS acknowledge uncertainty about the role these factors play in the decline of the DPS. One commenter claimed that low abundances, diversity, and distribution, limited habitat, and poor productivity make the DPS more vulnerable to the effects of disease and predation.

Response: Additional research is needed to determine if and how disease and predation, in combination with other factors, may limit the viability of Puget Sound steelhead. It is our understanding that little research on steelhead is currently being undertaken in these important areas.

Comment 30: There was general agreement by commenters that no single factor described in Section 4(a)(1) of the ESA and NMFS' implementing regulations (50 CFR part 424) has caused the decline of Puget Sound steelhead. Many commenters felt that a primary focus for recovery of the DPS should be an improvement of hatchery practices. Others believed that habitat restoration and protection are essential to the recovery of the DPS. In particular, some commenters felt that hydropower dams, floodplain development, water withdrawals, and logging are factors in the decline of the DPS that must be addressed in recovery planning.

Response: These and other factors have contributed to the decline of Puget Sound steelhead and will need to be addressed in recovery planning for this DPS. We believe that the recent Shared Strategy for Puget Sound (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007) provides an excellent foundation upon which to build and address issues and risk factors unique to Puget Sound steelhead. We are also encouraged by WDFW's progress in developing statewide and regional plans for steelhead to promote policies, strategies, and actions that will improve steelhead management in Puget Sound and elsewhere.

Comments on the Consideration of Protective Efforts/Mitigating Factors

Comment 31: Two commenters agreed with our determination in the proposed rule that existing protective efforts, including the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007), hatchery reform efforts, and Habitat Conservation Plans, are not adequate to remedy the harmful factors that are depressing Puget Sound steelhead. Others believed that habitat protection and restoration provisions, including the Washington Forest Practices and Governor's Puget Sound Initiative, are far more substantial than those in place at the time of our initial status review (Busby *et al.*, 1996). Many expressed concern that we would inappropriately apply our PECE policy and decide that listing is not warranted. Another requested clarification of which land-use regulations across Puget Sound do not adequately address the continued threats from habitat degradation and modification and which presently unregulated activities, require regulation to protect the habitat of the DPS.

Response: We have not received information to support changing our conclusion that current protective efforts collectively do not provide sufficient certainty of implementation and effectiveness to substantially ameliorate the level of assessed extinction risk for Puget Sound steelhead. While we acknowledge that many of the ongoing protective efforts are more substantial than those in place when we originally reviewed the status of this DPS, many efforts are relatively recent or still under development, and as yet have insufficient regulatory measures and/or resources in place to assure their implementation and effectiveness in addressing the factors for the decline of and threats facing Puget Sound steelhead.

In our proposed rule we identified a number of land use activities that impact Puget Sound steelhead, including forestry, agriculture, and urban development (71 FR 15672; March 29, 2006). In addition, the local watershed chapters in the recent recovery plan for Puget Sound Chinook (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007) are an excellent resource for understanding the myriad land use issues (and restoration opportunities) facing salmon and steelhead in specific watersheds throughout Puget Sound. Through our ESA consultations and ongoing recovery planning forums we will continue to collaborate with tribal, Federal, state, and local entities, and the public to promote and improve efforts being made to protect Puget Sound steelhead.

Final Species Determination

We did not receive nor review any new information that would warrant revision of the proposed geographic boundaries delineating the Puget Sound steelhead DPS. These steelhead are markedly separated from other such population groups of *O. mykiss* as a consequence of physical, physiological, ecological, or behavioral factors (Busby *et al.*, 1996; NMFS, 2005). Therefore, we conclude that steelhead in Puget Sound satisfy the ''discreteness'' criterion under the joint DPS policy. We also conclude that Puget Sound steelhead

represent an important component in the evolutionary legacy of the *O. mykiss* species based on their unique life-history, genetic, and ecological characteristics, as well as the unique glacial and fjord-like characteristics of the ecoregion occupied (Busby *et al.*, 1996). These traits satisfy the ''significance'' criterion of the joint DPS Policy. If Puget Sound steelhead DPS were lost, it would represent: (1) the loss of unusual or unique habitats and ecosystems occupied by the species; (2) a significant gap in the species' range; and (3) a significant loss to the ecological, life-history, and genetic diversity of the taxon.

Based on the BRT's findings, our review of comments summarized above, and our considerations under the joint DPS policy, we conclude that Puget Sound steelhead warrant delineation as a DPS under the ESA. Consistent with our proposed rule, the geographic boundaries of the Puget Sound steelhead DPS continue to include winter- and summer-run steelhead populations in the river basins of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and Hood Canal, Washington, bounded to the west by the Elwha River (inclusive) and to the north by the Nooksack River and Dakota Creek (inclusive).

Final Assessment of Extinction Risk

We did not receive any new information that would warrant revision of the BRT's assessment of extinction risk. As described in more detail in our proposed rule for this DPS (71 FR 15666;, March 29, 2006), the BRT assessed the risk of extinction for Puget Sound steelhead at two levels: first at the individual population level; and then at the overall DPS level. At both levels the BRT evaluated the likely contributions of resident and hatchery-origin fish to DPS viability. The BRT's DPS-level extinction risk assessment reflects professional scientific judgment guided by an analysis of the factors contributing to VSP (McElhany *et al.*, 2000), as well as by expectations about the likely interactions among the individual VSP factors. Specifically, the BRT concluded that there is: (1) A high risk to the viability of Puget Sound steelhead due to declining productivity and abundance; (2) a moderate risk due to reduced spatial complexity of, and connectivity among, populations; and (3) a moderate risk due to the reduced life-history diversity of populations and the potential threats posed by artificial propagation and harvest practices in Puget Sound. As a result, an overwhelming majority of the BRT concluded that Puget Sound steelhead are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all of their range.

The BRT's conclusion was expressed in terms that correspond to the statutory definition of a threatened species in the ESA. The BRT's assessment, however, did not include an evaluation of efforts being made to protect the species, as required under section 4(b)(1)(A) of the ESA. The following sections briefly summarize the likely factors for the decline of Puget Sound steelhead, as well as the efforts being made to protect steelhead and other salmonids in the Puget Sound region. The reader is referred to our proposed rule for more detailed information and discussion concerning threats and protective efforts affecting Puget Sound steelhead (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006).

Summary of Factors Affecting the Species

Section 4(a)(1) of the ESA requires that we determine whether any species is endangered or threatened because of any one or a combination of the following factors: (1) The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range; (2) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (3) disease or predation; (4) inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or (5) other natural or human-made factors affecting its continued existence. We have previously detailed the impacts of various factors contributing to the decline of Pacific salmon and *O. mykiss* in previous listing determinations (e.g., 62 FR 43937, August 18, 1997; 57 FR 14517, March 25, 1999) and supporting documentation (e.g., NMFS, 1997, ''Factors Contributing to the Decline of Chinook Salmon An Addendum to the 1996 West Coast Steelhead Factors for Decline Report;'' NMFS, 1996, ''Factors for Decline A Supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead Under the Endangered Species Act''). NMFS' **Federal Register** notices and technical reports conclude that all of the factors identified in section 4(a)(1) of the ESA have played a role in the decline of West Coast salmon and *O. mykiss* DPSs. The reader is referred to the above **Federal Register** notices and technical reports for a more detailed treatment of the relevant factors leading to the decline of specific DPSs.

In the proposed rule, we evaluated those factors of specific relevance to steelhead in the Puget Sound area. We concluded that the principal factor for decline for Puget Sound steelhead is the present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range. Barriers to fish passage and adverse effects on water quality and quantity resulting from dams, the loss of wetland and riparian habitats, and agricultural and urban development activities have contributed and continue to contribute to the loss and degradation of steelhead habitats in Puget Sound. We observed that previous harvest management practices likely contributed to the historical decline of Puget Sound steelhead, but concluded that the elimination of the direct harvest of wild steelhead in the mid 1990s has largely addressed this threat. We noted that predation by marine mammals (principally seals and sea lions) and birds may be of concern in some local areas experiencing dwindling steelhead run sizes. With respect to disease (e.g., infectious diseases exacerbated by some hatchery practices), we concluded that we lack specific current or historical information to determine whether it poses a significant threat to the DPS. We concluded that existing regulatory mechanisms inadequately protect steelhead habitats as evidenced by the historical and continued threat posed by the loss and degradation of nearshore, estuarine, and lowland habitats due to agricultural activities and urbanization. We concluded that ocean and climate conditions can have profound impacts on the continued existence of steelhead populations. Finally, we reiterated concerns regarding the extensive propagation of the Chambers Creek and Skamania hatchery steelhead stocks and their possible contribution to the observed declines in Puget Sound steelhead populations, while acknowledging that there is insufficient information to quantify the extent of potential adverse impacts.

Efforts Being Made To Protect West Coast Steelhead

Section 4(b)(1)(A) of the ESA requires the Secretary to make listing determinations solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available after taking into account efforts being made to protect a species. Therefore, in making ESA listing determinations, we first assess a DPS's level of extinction risk and identify factors that have led to its decline. We then assess existing efforts being made to protect the species to determine if those measures ameliorate the risks faced by the DPS. In judging the efficacy of existing protective efforts that have not yet been implemented or demonstrated effectiveness, we rely on the PECE (68 FR 15100; March 28, 2003). The PECE articulates several criteria for evaluating the certainty of implementation and effectiveness of protective efforts to aid in determining

whether a species warrants listing as threatened or endangered.

In the proposed rule, we provided an extensive review of protective efforts affecting Puget Sound steelhead, ranging in scope from regional conservation strategies to local watershed initiatives (71 FR 15666; March 29, 2006). We did not receive new information to support changing our conclusion that protective efforts collectively do not provide empirical evidence or sufficient certainty of implementation and effectiveness to substantially ameliorate the level of assessed extinction risk for Puget Sound steelhead. While we acknowledge that many of the ongoing protective efforts for this DPS, especially those contained in the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound (Shared Strategy Development Committee, 2007) and proposed in the Draft Statewide Steelhead Plan and regional plans (WDFW, 2007), are likely to promote steelhead conservation, many efforts are relatively recent or still under development, and as yet have insufficient regulatory measures and/or resources in place to assure their implementation and effectiveness in addressing the factors for the decline of and threats facing Puget Sound steelhead. We will continue to encourage these and other future protective efforts, and we will continue to collaborate with tribal, Federal, state, and local entities to promote and improve efforts being made to protect the species.

Final Listing Determination

After reviewing the public comments received, independent expert reviewer comments, and other data available to us, we find that there is no available information that would cause us to reconsider the extinction risk assessments by the BRT (NMFS, 2005), nor substantially alter our assessments of the Section 4(a)(1) listing factors and efforts being made to protect the species. We conclude that the Puget Sound steelhead DPS is likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all of its range, and warrants listing as a threatened species under the ESA.

Prohibitions and Protective Regulations

ESA section 9(a)(1) take and other prohibitions (16 U.S.C. 1538(a)(1)) apply to all species of fish or wildlife listed as endangered. In the case of threatened species, ESA section 4(d) directs the Secretary to issue such regulations as are determined to be necessary and advisable for the conservation of the species. We have flexibility under section 4(d) to tailor protective regulations based on the contributions of available conservation measures. The 4(d) protective regulations may prohibit, with respect to threatened species, some or all of the acts which section 9(a) of the ESA prohibits with respect to endangered species. These 9(a) prohibitions and 4(d) regulations apply to all persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction, including individuals, corporations, and government agencies and their employees.

On February 7, 2007 (72 FR 5648), we proposed to issue section 4(d) protective regulations for Puget Sound steelhead. The proposed regulations would prohibit the take of Puget Sound steelhead unless a ''limit'' applies for specified categories of activities determined to be adequately protective of these fish. We have received public comment on that proposal and will address those comments when we finalize the protective regulations for this DPS in a subsequent **Federal Register** notice.

Identification of Those Activities That Would Constitute a Violation of Section 9 of the ESA

We and the FWS published in the **Federal Register** on July 1, 1994 (59 FR 34272), a policy that the agencies shall identify, to the maximum extent practicable at the time a species is listed, those activities that would or would not constitute a violation of section 9 of the ESA. The intent of this policy is to increase public awareness of the effect of this listing on proposed and ongoing activities within the species' range. As noted above, final 4(d) protective regulations will be issued in a subsequent **Federal Register** notice, and until such regulations are final, Puget Sound steelhead will not be subject to ESA take protections. If and when we issue any final 4(d) protective regulations, we will identify to the extent known the activities that will not be considered likely to result in violation of section 9, as well as activities that will be considered likely to result in violation.

Effective Date of the Final Listing Determination

The final listing for Puget Sound steelhead will take effect on June 11, 2007.

Critical Habitat

Section 4(a)(3)(A) of the ESA requires that, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, critical habitat be designated concurrently with the listing of a species. Section 4(b)(6)(C)(ii) provides that, where critical habitat is not determinable at the time of final listing, we may extend the period for designating critical habitat by not more than 1 additional year. In keeping with agency regulations at 50 CFR 424.12, we conclude that critical habitat is not presently determinable for the Puget Sound steelhead DPS. Specifically, we lack biological, economic, and related mapping information sufficient to determine which areas may qualify as critical habitat for this DPS and to determine the economic, national security, or other relevant impacts of designation necessary to perform required analyses of the impacts of critical habitat designation . Therefore, we are proceeding with the final listing determination now and will propose critical habitat in a separate rulemaking.

Classification

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

ESA listing decisions are exempt from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the NEPA. See NOAA Administrative Order 216–6.03(e)(1) and *Pacific Legal Foundation* v. *Andrus*, 657 F.2d 829 (6th Cir. 1981). Thus, we have determined that the final listing determination for the Puget Sound steelhead DPS described in this notice is exempt from the requirements of NEPA.

Regulatory Flexibility Act, Executive Order (E.O.) 12866, and Paperwork Reduction Act

As noted in the Conference Report on the 1982 amendments to the ESA, economic impacts cannot be considered when deciding on the listing of a species. Therefore, the economic analysis requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act are not applicable to the listing process. In addition, this rule is exempt from review under E.O. 12866. This final rule does not contain a collection-of-information requirement for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Peer Review

A joint NMFS/FWS policy requires us to solicit independent expert review from at least three qualified specialists, concurrent with the public comment period (59 FR 34270; July 1, 1994). In December 2004 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (Peer Review Bulletin) establishing minimum peer review standards, a transparent process for public disclosure, and opportunities for public input. The OMB Peer Review

Bulletin, implemented under the Information Quality Act (Public Law 106 554), is intended to ensure the quality of agency information, analyses, and regulatory activities and provide for a more transparent peer review process.

The BRT's status review for Puget Sound steelhead (NMFS, 2005) is the key science document underlying the decision to list Puget Sound steelhead as a threatened species. As described in our proposed rule, the BRT's status review was considered to be ''influential scientific information'' in the context of the OMB Peer Review Bulletin and was subjected to pre-dissemination peer review (60 FR 15666, March 29, 2006). A description of the peer review plan was posted on the Internet in December 2005 by the U.S. Department of Commerce and is available at: *http://www.osec.doc.gov/cio/oipr/ID47.htm*. The seven experts chosen for this review are knowledgeable in steelhead biology, artificial propagation, fisheries management, and local and regional habitat conditions and processes. Four of the experts provided peer review and their comments were thoroughly considered, and, as appropriate, incorporated into the BRT's assessment and this final listing determination. We believe that adherence to the OMB Peer Review Bulletin is consistent with the goals of the 1994 NMFS/FWS policy ''to ensure the best biological and commercial information is being used in the decisionmaking process, as well as to ensure that reviews by recognized experts are incorporated into the review process of rulemakings'' developed in accordance with the ESA.

E.O. 13175 – Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments

The longstanding and distinctive relationship between the Federal and tribal governments is defined by treaties, statutes, executive orders, judicial decisions, and co-management agreements, which differentiate tribal governments from the other entities that deal with, or are affected by, the Federal government. This relationship has given rise to a special Federal trust responsibility involving the legal responsibilities and obligations of the United States toward Indian Tribes and the application of fiduciary standards of due care with respect to Indian lands, tribal trust resources, and the exercise of tribal rights. E.O. 13175 outlines the responsibilities of the Federal Government in matters affecting tribal interests.

During our status review of Puget Sound steelhead we solicited information from the tribes, met with several tribal governments and associated tribal fisheries commissions, and provided the opportunity for all interested tribes to comment on the proposed listing of this DPS and discuss any concerns they may have. Several tribes submitted comments during the public comment period and these were thoroughly considered and incorporated (e.g., see comment 5, 6, 12, 23, and 26), as appropriate, into our final listing determination. We will continue to coordinate with the tribes on management and conservation actions related to this species.

E.O. 13132 – Federalism

E.O. 13132 requires agencies to take into account any federalism impacts of regulations under development. It includes specific consultation directives for situations where a regulation will preempt state law, or impose substantial direct compliance costs on state and local governments (unless required by statute). This rule establishes the protected status of Puget Sound steelhead under the ESA. It thereby creates obligations on Federal agencies, e.g., to consult on their proposed actions that may affect Puget Sound steelhead. It does not impose requirements for, or restrictions on, state or local governments. Accordingly, E.O. 13132 does not apply to this final listing determination. In keeping with the intent of the Administration and Congress to provide continuing and meaningful dialogue on issues of mutual tribal, state and Federal interest, we provided the proposed rule to the relevant agencies in each state in which the subject species occurs, and these agencies were invited to comment. As noted in the previous section and in our response to comments (e.g., see comment 1, 2, 7, and 25), this final rule takes into account the views and comments received from state agencies. We will continue to consider any federalism impacts of regulations still under development for this DPS, such as our ongoing consideration of potential ESA protective regulations and critical habitat areas for Puget Sound steelhead.

References

A complete list of all references cited herein is available upon request (see **ADDRESSES**), or can be obtained from the Internet at: *http://www.nwr.noaa.gov*.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 223

Endangered and threatened species, Exports, Imports, Transportation.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 223 is amended as follows:

PART 223—THREATENED MARINE AND ANADROMOUS SPECIES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 223 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1531–1543; subpart B, § 223.201 also issued under 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 223.102, paragraph (c)(23) is added to read as follows:

§ 223.102 Enumeration of threatened marine and anadromous species.

* * * * *

Species[1]		Where Listed	Citation(s) for Listing Determinations	Citation(s) for Critical Habitat
Common name	Scientific name			
*****				
(c) ***				

Species[1]		Where Listed	Citation(s) for Listing Determinations	Citation(s) for Critical Habitat
Common name	Scientific name			
(23) Puget Sound Steelhead	Oncorhynchus mykiss	U.S.A., WA, Distinct Population Segment including all naturally spawned anadromous *O. mykiss* (steelhead) populations, from streams in the river basins of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and Hood Canal, Washington, bounded to the west by the Elwha River (inclusive) and to the north by the Nooksack River and Dakota Creek (inclusive), as well as the Green River natural and Hamma Hamma winter-run steelhead hatchery stocks.	[*Insert FEDERAL REGISTER page citation*]May 11, 2007	NA
* * * * *				

[1]Species includes taxonomic species, subspecies, distinct population segments (DPSs) (for a policy statement, see 61 FR 4722, February 7, 1996), and evolutionarily significant units (ESUs) (for a policy statement, see 56 FR 58612, November 20, 1991)

[FR Doc. E7–9089 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 635

[Docket No. 070307055–7099–02; I.D. 022607F]

RIN 0648–AV25

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); U.S. Atlantic Billfish Tournament Management Measures

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule suspends mandatory circle hook requirements for participants in Atlantic billfish fishing tournaments through December 31, 2007. Circle hook requirements will be reinstated unchanged effective 12:01 a.m., January 1, 2008. The suspension is intended to increase post-release survival rates of Atlantic billfish in the long-term by providing an additional phase-in period during which Atlantic billfish tournament anglers can become more proficient and familiar with circle hooks and their ecological benefits, respectively.

DATES: In this final rule, § 635.21, paragraph (e)(2)(iii), is suspended from May 11, 2007 to December 31, 2007, and is revised effective January 1, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Final Environmental Assessment/Regulatory Impact Review/Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (Final EA/RIR/FRFA) are available from the Highly Migratory Species Management Division website at *www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms* or can be obtained by contacting Russell Dunn or Randy Blankinship (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Dunn or Randy Blankinship, by phone: 727–824–5399; by fax: 727–824–5398.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. recreational fishery for Atlantic billfish is managed under the Consolidated Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan (FMP). Implementing regulations at 50 CFR part 635 are issued under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), and the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (ATCA) (16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq).*

Background

NMFS recently finalized a Consolidated HMS FMP (October 2, 2006; 71 FR 58058) that consolidated and replaced previous FMPs for Atlantic Billfish and Atlantic Tunas, Swordfish, and Sharks. The Consolidated HMS FMP is implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 635.

Prior to January 1, 2007, the recreational Atlantic billfish fishery was subject to regulations that required fishing permits, limited allowable gears to rod and reel only, established minimum legal size limits, specified landing form of retained billfish, mandated reporting of billfish landings, required registration of all recreational HMS fishing tournaments and reporting by tournaments that are selected for reporting, prohibited the retention of longbill spearfish, and prohibited sale of any billfish, among other measures. The final rule implementing the Consolidated HMS FMP implemented additional regulations that applied to the Atlantic recreational billfish fishery.

Effective January 1, 2007, these regulations require anglers fishing from HMS permitted vessels and participating in Atlantic billfish tournaments to use only non-offset circle hooks when deploying natural baits or natural bait/artificial lure combinations. The regulations allow the use of J-hooks (the hook-type traditionally used in this fishery) with artificial lures in tournaments, and do not impose hook requirements on recreational fishermen fishing outside of Atlantic billfish tournaments. Additionally, the final rule limits U.S. landings of Atlantic blue and white marlin to 250 individual fish, combined, on an annual basis.

In response to continuing public input on the Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook regulations, NMFS released a draft environmental assessment and published a proposed rule on March 15, 2007 (72 FR 12154), that included a preferred alternative to suspend Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirements through December 31, 2007. The EA considered three alternatives. Information regarding these alternatives was provided in the proposed rule and is not repeated here.

Response to Comments

The public comment period for the proposed rule was open from March 15, 2007 to March 30, 2007. During that time, NMFS held three public hearings and received comments from 111 individuals or organizations. A summary of the major comments received, along with NMFS' responses are provided below.

Comment 1: Several commenters in favor of Alternative 1, the no action alternative (status quo), stated that the existing measure is necessary to protect Atlantic white marlin stocks and promote rebuilding. Similarly other commenters felt that maintaining the circle hook requirement would be beneficial in reducing the likelihood of listing white marlin as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

Response: NMFS agrees that maintaining the circle hook requirement would continue to provide post-release hooking mortality benefits; however, given the short duration of the circle hook suspension, NMFS projects that it will result in a one-time limited number of additional white marlin post-release mortalities that would not adversely affect the Atlantic wide stock in a measurable way. NMFS believes that the provision of an additional phase-in period during which anglers can become more proficient, comfortable, and accepting of circle hooks will, in the long-term, offset the short-term increase in mortalities by resulting in greater long-term compliance with circle hook regulations. The white marlin listing review, conducted under the Endangered Species Act, is currently underway. The biological review team conducting the review may consider the impacts of all fishery management measures in effect including circle hook requirements when making its recommendations. NMFS cannot predict the outcome of the review team's deliberations or the direct impact that any particular regulation may have on the outcome of such deliberations.

Comment 2: NMFS received comment in support of Alternative 1, the no action alternative (status quo), because commenters felt there are many different ways of rigging baits with circle hooks that have been tested and proven to work.

Response: NMFS received similar comment during and following development of the circle hook requirement from anglers stating that successful methods of rigging baits with circle hooks exist and are practiced. NMFS agrees that appropriate rigging techniques for circle hooks exist which allow anglers to successfully catch Atlantic billfish. Further, Prince et al. 2002, found no statistical difference between catch rates between circle hooks and J-hooks using both natural dead bait trolling and live bait drifting/kite fishing techniques. Additionally, several popular articles have been published in major sportfishing magazines that highlight some of these methods. However, NMFS believes that an improved long-term ecological benefit can be achieved by allowing an additional phase-in period for the reasons discussed in the response to Comment 1.

Comment 3: The Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) expressed support for alternative 1, the no action alternative (status quo). MDNR cited its work with the recreational fishing community and the billfish tournament directors in Maryland to educate anglers regarding the conservation benefits of circle hook use and stated that the major billfish tournaments in Maryland anticipated the circle hook requirement and prepared for it. MDNR cited success with implementation of circle hook requirements in Maryland's special catch and release fishery for striped bass in the Chesapeake Bay and stated that suspending the circle hook requirement for Atlantic billfish tournaments would send the wrong message to recreational anglers.

Response: NMFS appreciates the conservation efforts of the MDNR. The suspension of the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments is a temporary measure with the purpose of providing additional time for anglers to become more familiar with techniques for rigging and fishing with circle hooks in Atlantic billfish tournaments, thus resulting in improved long-term compliance with the circle hook requirement upon reimplementation. NMFS has worked to increase awareness among anglers of the benefits of circle hooks and will continue to do so during and following the temporary suspension.

Comment 4: NMFS received comment in support of alternative 1, the no action alternative (status quo), because of the lack of time for tournament operators to get the word to all potential participants about what gear is allowed. Alternatively, NMFS received comment in support of the preferred alternative so that tournament rules would not have to be rewritten this year as some tournaments may have published their rules using 2006 regulations.

Response: NMFS received comment from multiple tournament operators indicating that some tournaments prepared for the circle hook requirement when it was implemented on January 1, 2007, while others were unaware or did not prepare. NMFS appreciates the concerns of tournament operators and anglers regarding the need to know what gear configurations are available for use in advance. NMFS also appreciates those constituents that were aware of and prepared for the requirement and regrets that tournament rules may need to be reprinted as a result of the temporary suspension of the regulation. NMFS also points out that tournaments in some areas of the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico have voluntarily implemented circle hook requirements in recent years and the temporary suspension of the requirement does not prevent this. NMFS encourages anglers and tournament operators to stay informed of HMS management issues and actions by visiting *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/* and signing up for the electronic bulletin, *Atlantic HMS News*.

Comment 5: NMFS received comment in support of the preferred alternative, temporarily suspend the Atlantic billfish circle hook requirement, that expressed a desire for NMFS to use the suspension period to accomplish several tasks. These suggestions include: improve the circle hook definition; investigate the availability of circle hooks for the recreational billfishing tackle market; investigate the post-release hooking mortality rates of J-hook and circle hook rigged natural and natural bait/artificial lure combination baits trolled at high speed such as is used frequently when targeting blue marlin; investigate the possibility of a minimum size J-hook that could be allowed when high speed trolling for blue marlin; investigate post-release mortality of billfish when lures with double hooks are used; investigate how the circle hook requirement affects tournaments with mixed target species; investigate whether the circle hook requirement would accomplish its intended objective or not; and investigate post-release hooking mortality differences between different presentations of J-hooks with live baits.

Response: NMFS agrees that information from studies such as some of those mentioned during public comment may be useful for refining management of the billfish fishery in the future as additional data become available. NMFS is working on a number of these issues including improving the definition of circle hooks and the potential for additional post-release mortality studies examining various gear and technique configurations.

Comment 6: NMFS received comment in favor of the preferred alternative, temporarily suspend the Atlantic billfish circle hook requirement; however, commenters expressed a desire for modifications to the circle hook requirement upon re-implementation. Commenters indicated that these modifications are popular for use when targeting blue marlin and are

less damaging to all billfish than J-hooks used with live or dead natural baits on light tackle. Some commenters making this suggestion stated that some of these modifications would help reduce the impact to anglers fishing in mixed species tournaments. Some commenters stated that these modifications would allow the continuation of North Carolina's historic and traditional method of fishing for blue marlin using heavy tackle and/or lure/bait combinations rigged with J-hooks and trolled at high speed. Suggested modifications included creating an exemption to the circle hook requirement to allow J-hook use with heavy tackle and/or lure/bait combinations trolled at high speed and creating an exemption to the circle hook requirement to allow J-hook use if the main line is less than 50 lb. test, less than 80 lb. test, leader size is less then 200 lb. test, hook is at least a certain size that cannot be be swallowed easily by a billfish (hook size suggestions were 9/0, 10/0, 11/0 and 12/0), or some combination of these criteria.

Response: NMFS acknowledges that limited information from the few blue marlin tagged with pop-off satellite archival tags (PSATs) (9 fish) in the study by Graves et al. (2001) shows relatively low rates of post-release mortality for blue marlin caught on J-hooks when certain gear configurations and techniques are employed. However, the sample size of this one study is limited and no information exists on the impacts of combination baits with J-hooks on white marlin and other billfish species. NMFS implemented the regulations requiring circle hooks on natural baits and natural bait/artificial lure combinations based on a number of considerations that are detailed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Consolidated HMS FMP. The basis for that decision included, but was not limited to: the post-release survival benefits of circle hooks for billfish and many other species identified in a number studies, comparable catch rates of billfish between circle hooks and J-hooks identified in available studies, the poor stock status of some Atlantic billfish species, the limited amount of available data on various gear configurations, and enforcement issues. NMFS will consider new information on the effects of the fishing methods mentioned above on fish condition and post-release mortality as it becomes available. NMFS acknowledges that the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments may have impacts on secondary fisheries including wahoo, king mackerel, dolphin, tunas, and other fisheries and has limited these impacts to the extent feasible in the creation of the circle hook requirement by applying it narrowly to only HMS permitted vessels participating in tournaments with award categories for Atlantic billfish. NMFS will consider new information on ways to limit impacts of HMS requirements on non-HMS fisheries as it becomes available. NMFS acknowledges that a traditional recreational fishery exists for blue marlin in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico that utilizes different fishing techniques in different locations and situations. The fishing technique of using heavy tackle and/or lure/bait combinations rigged with J-hooks and trolled at high speed is used in several locations throughout the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. The fishery management strategy employed to reduce post-release hooking mortality of Atlantic billfish through the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments is a modification of the techniques used in this fishery. NMFS received public comment during and following development of the circle hook requirement from anglers that successful methods of rigging baits with circle hooks exist and are practiced. Additionally, several articles have been published in major sportfishing magazines that highlight some of these methods. NMFS believes that through this and other fishery management strategies, the traditional recreational fishery for blue marlin and other Atlantic billfish may be improved by promoting stock rebuilding.

Comment 7: NMFS received comment from the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) indicating their support for the preferred alternative, temporarily suspend the Atlantic billfish circle hook requirement. NCDMF stated that the current rule may negatively impact angler's ability to catch blue marlin. Concern was expressed over the impacts of mandating circle hook use for natural baits and natural bait/combinations for all tackle sizes. NCDMF encouraged NMFS to explore the circle hook definition, conduct research on release mortality of billfish released on heavy tackle with J-hooks, research the difference in catch rates of circle and J-hooks for non-billfish species targeted in tournaments, and explore recently raised questions concerning post-release mortality of billfish caught on double hooked lures. NCDMF expressed concern that a shortage of large non-offset circle hooks to supply the billfish fishery may exist.

Response: NMFS appreciates the comments of the NCDMF. The purpose of the temporary suspension of the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments is to allow additional time for anglers to become more familiar with techniques for rigging and fishing with circle hooks in Atlantic billfish tournaments, thus resulting in improved long-term compliance with the requirement upon reimplementation. As discussed in the response to Comment 6, NMFS received comment during and following development of the circle hook requirement from anglers stating that successful methods of rigging baits with circle hooks exist and are practiced. Additionally, several articles have been published in major sportfishing magazines that highlight some of these methods.

Regarding the application of the circle hook requirement for all tackle sizes, NMFS developed the requirement with consideration for several different concerns which included application to the targeted fishery and the ease of enforcement, as well as other considerations identified in the response to Comment 6 and discussed in detail in the FEIS for the Consolidated HMS FMP. NMFS believes that the requirements for the use of circle hooks by permitted HMS fishermen when natural bait and natural bait/artificial lures are deployed in billfish tournaments improve its enforceability. Related to application of the requirement to all tackle sizes and researching post-release mortality for various tackle types, NMFS will consider new information on the effects of the fishing methods on fish condition and post-release hooking mortality, as it becomes available. NMFS has not received information indicating that a shortage of large non-offset circle hooks exists other than that contained in NCDMF's comment. The circle hook requirement was finalized in October 2006 and became effective January 1, 2007, providing time for circle hook manufacturers and retail stores to increase inventory. The Atlantic billfish tournament season is protracted and peaks in the late spring and summer months, thereby providing additional time for manufacturers and retailers to prepare for demand. The preferred alternative to temporarily suspend the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments may dampen the peak in demand for circle hooks in 2007 as anglers will not be required to use circle hooks, but may still desire to practice with them in preparation for re-implementation of the requirement on

January 1, 2008. However, as mentioned, NMFS has received no information from anglers, distributors, tackle shops, tournament operators, or manufacturers that a real or potential shortage of hooks exists.

Comment 8: NMFS received comment in favor of non-preferred alternative 3, remove Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirements, for various reasons including: insufficient data to implement a circle hook requirement in billfish tournaments; voluntary use of circle hooks should continue to be encouraged; fear that similar requirements will be imposed in all offshore trolling for any species to reduce billfish post-release mortality; concerns that circle hooks lodging in the corner of the jaw actually are the most painful and cause long-term damage to the fish resulting in a decreased ability of the fish to feed and increased rates of death relative to billfish caught with J-hooks.

Response: NMFS disagrees that there is insufficient data to implement a circle hook requirement in billfish tournaments. NMFS has relied on publicly available peer-reviewed scientific papers and available recreational data sets in developing its analyses. The assumptions made to support the use of circle hooks are clearly articulated in Chapter 4 of the Consolidated HMS FMP. NMFS agrees that voluntary circle hook use in HMS fisheries outside of Atlantic billfish tournaments should be encouraged. Voluntary use of circle hooks was promoted in the years prior to implementation of the circle hook regulation on January 1, 2007; however, this voluntary promotion only achieved limited success in transitioning recreational anglers to circle hooks in the Atlantic billfish fishery. NMFS does not anticipate that continued promotion of voluntary circle hook use alone by tournament anglers would result in achieving the maximum conservation benefit possible of reduced post-release mortality of Atlantic billfish relative to the no action alternative. NMFS acknowledges that requiring circle hooks in all HMS fisheries could have impacts on secondary fisheries, including tunas, sharks, dolphin, wahoo, king mackerel, etc., and other inshore fisheries and has taken steps to minimize these impacts, as discussed under the response to comment 6. NMFS disagrees that circle hooks lodging in the corner of the jaw are more damaging to fish in the long-term and result in fish death more frequently than with J-hooks. This comment is not supported by peer reviewed scientific literature showing lower post-release mortality of white marlin when caught with circle hooks in comparison with J-hooks and showing less damaging hook location in sailfish and blue marlin when caught with circle hooks in comparison with J-hooks.

Comment 9: NMFS received comment from lure manufacturers stating that rigging circle hooks with hard headed artificial lures and natural baits is an ineffective method of catching billfish and has resulted in substantial loss of lure sales. One manufacturer stated that the combined economic impact from Central American circle hook requirements and the domestic circle hook requirement implemented in January 2007, the requirement was large enough to cause his company to go out of business. Similarly, another lure manufacturer stated that hard headed lures with nylon skirts are designed to be trolled at high speed in conjunction with natural baits and J-hooks resulting in almost all fish being hooked in the mouth. One manufacturer expressed support for alternative 3, removal of Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirements, and another requested that NMFS further investigate an exemption for artificial lure/natural bait combinations rigged with J-hooks and trolled at high speed.

Response: NMFS appreciates the comment that economic impacts may have occurred as a result of previous rulemaking to implement the circle hook requirement on January 1, 2007. As discussed in the response to Comment 6, NMFS received comment during and following development of the circle hook requirement from anglers stating that successful methods of rigging baits with circle hooks exist and are practiced. Additionally, several articles have been published in major sportfishing magazines that highlight some of these methods including methods to rig and fish with hard headed lures with nylon skirts used in combination with natural baits. NMFS acknowledges that investigating questions about certain gear and rigging types such as that mentioned above may provide additional useful information in the future and will consider these issues when identifying future research priorities.

Comment 10: NMFS received comment that no data exists to support application of the circle hook requirement to blue marlin fishing methods that employ circle hook rigged baits trolled at high speed. These comments stated that the damage to billfish when J-hooks are used in baits trolled at high speed is less than when J-hooks are used with dead or live natural baits on light tackle. These comments also stated that no data exists to support the concept of the circle hook requirement that large baits, lures, or artificial/natural combination baits rigged with circle hooks and trolled at high speed result in an adequate hook-up rate.

Response: As discussed in the response to Comment 6, NMFS developed the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments with consideration for several different concerns, including but not limited to: the post-release survival benefits of circle hooks for multiple billfish species and other species identified in a several studies, comparable catch rates of various billfishes between circle hooks and J-hooks as identified in available studies, the poor stock status of some Atlantic billfish species, and enforcement issues. Accordingly, the rule applies to natural and natural/artificial combination baits. NMFS acknowledges that limited information from the few blue marlin tagged with PSATs (9 fish) in the study by Graves et al. (2001) shows relatively low rates of post-release mortality for blue marlin caught on J-hooks when certain gear configurations and techniques are employed. No information exists, however, on the impacts of this fishing technique on white marlin and other billfish species. With this uncertainty of impacts in particular to white marlin, the regulation was developed in a manner to provide additional protection to severely overfished Atlantic billfishes. NMFS will consider new information on the effects of the fishing methods mentioned above on fish condition and post-release hooking mortality, as it becomes available. As discussed in the response to Comment 6, NMFS received comment during and following development of the circle hook requirement from anglers that successful methods of rigging baits with circle hooks exist and are practiced. Additionally, several articles have been published in major sportfishing magazines that highlight some of these methods including methods to rig and fish with hard headed lures with nylon skirts used in combination with natural baits.

Comment 11: NMFS received comment suggesting that fees be assessed on all HMS recreational permits and HMS registered tournaments to fund PSAT tagging for post- release mortality comparisons between circle hooks and J-hooks.

Response: NMFS appreciates the suggestion as funding for continued post-release mortality studies in Atlantic billfish fisheries is needed. Suggestions for research funding will be

considered as future research needs are assessed.

Comment 12: NMFS received comment that the existing circle hook requirement is not compatible with mixed species tournaments and will reduce the ability of anglers to catch wahoo, dolphin, tuna, and others.

Response: NMFS understands that the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments will affect anglers in HMS permitted vessels targeting species other than Atlantic billfish. Many pelagic fish species are found in the same areas as Atlantic billfish and feed on similar prey. Atlantic billfish may be caught in many areas using the same fishing methods employed for other pelagic species such as wahoo, dolphin, tuna, king mackerel, and others; therefore, circle hooks are necessary in that portion of the tournament fishery. NMFS sought to minimize the impacts on secondary species by limiting the applicability of circle hook regulations as discussed in the response to Comment 6.

Comment 13: NMFS received comment that the existing circle hook requirement is not enforceable and relies on tournament operators as the only enforcement agent. NMFS also received public comment that the circle hook requirement would be enforceable.

Response: The requirements for the use of circle hooks by permitted HMS fishermen when natural bait and natural bait/artificial lures are deployed in billfish tournaments can be adequately enforced by NOAA Enforcement and the United States Coast Guard. As most tournament's rules require anglers to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations, NMFS believes that an important incentive for anglers to comply with regulations is the potential to have a prize-winning fish disqualified for not deploying a circle hook when required.

Comment 14: NMFS received comment that all fishing tournaments should be banned.

Response: NMFS disagrees. Atlantic HMS tournaments represent an important component of a robust recreational fishery and provide substantial socio-economic benefits to many communities. Further, tournaments represent an essential mechanism for obtaining significant amounts of data on many species that are incorporated into fish population assessments and management decisions.

Comment 15: NMFS received comment that tournaments are venues that could provide a large number of interactions with marlin and should be used to collect data to answer the post-release hooking mortality questions for blue and white marlin.

Response: NMFS appreciates the interest in collecting post-release hooking mortality information and agrees that tournaments can provide, for some fishery management issues, a venue for collecting fisheries information via appropriately designed data collection protocols. Such situations have been and continue to be valuable for collecting billfish information such as through the Recreational Billfish Survey and other life history studies. Such activity is not affected by this rulemaking.

Comment 16: NMFS received comment that the recreational fishing mortality level for billfish does not compare to the much larger pelagic longline mortality level thus the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments is directed at the wrong mortality source.

Response: The United States is responsible for approximately 4.5 percent of reported white marlin catches in the Atlantic. As explained in Appendix C of the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP, average annual fishing mortality levels imposed by the domestic pelagic longline fishery and the recreational tournament fishery on Atlantic white marlin are roughly comparable. Based on pelagic longline logbook data and data from the Recreational Billfish Survey, the level of billfish mortality imposed by U.S. recreational billfish tournament fishermen is estimated to be approximately 71% of levels imposed by the U.S. pelagic longline fishery. While the post-release mortality rate of Atlantic white marlin is estimated to be lower in recreational fisheries than in the pelagic longline fishery, the size of the recreational tournament fishery is large enough to generally offset the difference in mortality rates.

Comment 17: NMFS received several comments that the preferred alternative, suspend Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirements through the close of 2007, is not favorable. These include: the proposed rule is not precautionary; compliance with the already established rule would be 100 percent; the proposed rule is not supported by the record; there is a lack of parity with this proposed rule as an extended phase-in period is proposed for recreational anglers, but there was no grace period for commercial fishermen when circle hooks were required; the timing of proposed rule is bad as tournaments are in May and June and anglers should be practicing with circle hooks already.

Response: NMFS appreciates the comment that temporary suspension of the circle hook rule is not precautionary and that compliance would be 100 percent. NMFS disagrees that temporary suspension of the circle hook requirement is not supported by the record as the rule will be re-implemented January 1, 2008. NMFS agrees that maintaining the circle hook requirement would continue to provide post-release hooking mortality benefits; however, given the short duration of the circle hook suspension, NMFS projects that it will result in a one-time limited number of additional white marlin post-release mortalities that would not affect the Atlantic wide stock in a measurable way. NMFS believes that the provision of an additional phase-in period during which anglers can become more proficient, comfortable, and accepting of circle hooks will, in the long-term, offset the short-term increase in mortalities by resulting in greater long-term compliance with circle hook regulations. NMFS disagrees that there is a lack of parity between implementation of the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments and the circle hook requirement for the pelagic longline (PLL) fishery because the bases for the two actions are different. The circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments is a domestic measure intended to aid in rebuilding Atlantic billfish stocks by reducing post-release fishing mortality to the extent practicable at this time. The circle hook requirement in the Atlantic PLL fishery responds to issuance of the 2004 Biological Opinion which determined that continued operation of the pelagic longline fishery without changes in fishing gears or techniques would jeopardize the existence of leatherback sea turtles. Per the Endangered Species Act, the Agency was required to implement changes in the way the pelagic longline operated. Rapid implementation of the circle hook requirement for PLL was necessary for the fishery to continue operating. This rulemaking is intended to reduce post-release mortality of Atlantic billfish in the long-term by temporarily suspending the circle hook requirement in Atlantic billfish tournaments to allow tournaments and tournament anglers additional time to become more familiar with techniques for rigging and fishing with circle hooks.

Comment 18: NMFS received comment that circle hook specifications should be defined and field tested. Commenters also stated that circle hook rigging workshops should be held or

videos should be developed. NMFS also received comment that 3 different circle hooks were used in recent research and all 3 worked well in reducing post-release mortality even with differences in their general design. Additionally, comment was received that it is important to stay consistent with what the international community is using as a definition of circle hooks because of tackle manufacturing and to reduce confusion.

Response: NMFS appreciates the numerous comments received about circle hook definition issues and is involved in discussions with hook manufacturers and gear experts to address many of these concerns. Further, NMFS is not aware of an internationally accepted definition of circle hooks. The Agency may consider this issue in future rulemaking, as appropriate.

Changes from the Proposed Rule

There are no changes from the proposed rule.

Classification

This final rule is published under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.* NMFS has determined that this final rule is consistent with the national standards of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, other provisions of the Act, and other applicable laws.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1), the Assistant Administrator finds that this final action relieves a restriction and therefore may be made effective upon its filing with the Office of the Federal Register. Specifically, the final action relieves a restriction for persons fishing from HMS permitted vessels in Atlantic billfish tournaments to fish only with non-offset circle hooks when using natural or natural/ artificial combination baits. Without this action, NMFS would continue to require anglers to use non-offset circle hooks when using natural or natural/artificial combination baits in Atlantic billfish tournaments and would not afford anglers an additional time to become more proficient with methods used to rig and fish with circle hooks and these baits. NMFS expects that this action will improve expertise and familiarity with methods for rigging and fishing with circle hooks in Atlantic billfish tournaments. As a result, NMFS expects improved long-term compliance with the regulation to use circle hooks in billfish tournaments when it goes back into effect on January 1, 2008. This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

In compliance with 5 U.S.C. 604, a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) was prepared for this rule. The FRFA analyzes the anticipated impacts of the preferred alternative and any significant alternatives to the final rule that could minimize significant economic impacts on small entities. Each of the statutory requirements of section 604 has been addressed, and a summary of the FRFA is provided below.

Section 604(a)(1) requires the Agency to state the objective and need for the rule. As stated in the preamble of the proposed rule, the objective of this final rule is to increase post-release survival of Atlantic billfishes by improving long-term compliance with billfish tournament non-offset circle hook regulations. Maximizing post-release survival of Atlantic billfishes is an important facet of rebuilding overfished Atlantic billfish stocks.

Section 604(a)(2) requires the Agency to summarize significant issues raised by the public in response to the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), a summary of the assessment of the agency of such issues, and a statement of any changes made in the rule as a result of such comments. NMFS received numerous comments on the proposed rule and draft EA during the public comment period. A summary of these comments and the Agency's responses is included in this final rule. NMFS did not receive any comments specific to the IRFA, but did receive one comment related to economic issues and concerns. Specifically, one fishing gear manufacturer stated that the combined impacts of a circle hook requirement imposed by a Central American country and the U.S. Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirement implemented domestically in January 2007 (cited previously) cost his company and others several hundred thousand dollars in lost revenues which was large enough to cause his company to go out of business. As such, this commenter supported a repeal of the circle hook regulations.

NMFS appreciates that economic impacts may have occurred as a result of previous rulemaking to implement the circle hook requirement on January 1, 2007; however, as noted by the commenter, these impacts resulted from a combination of foreign regulations and a previous domestic rulemaking. This comment is responded to fully with other comments (see Comment 9). The preferred alternative in this final rule could have minor short-term positive impacts on the sales of fishing lures used in conjunction with natural baits by temporarily allowing anglers to utilize J-hooks. While the final rule has the effect of temporarily allowing anglers to utilize J-hooks, the circle hook suspension was not made as a result of this comment.

Section 604(a)(3) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires the Agency to describe and provide an estimate of the number of small entities to which the rule will apply. NMFS considers all HMS permit holders to be small entities because they either had gross receipts less than $4.0 million for fish-harvesting, gross receipts less than $6.5 million for charter/party boats, or 100 or fewer employees for wholesale dealers. These are the Small Business Association size standards for defining a small versus large business entity in these industries. As of January 29, 2007, the potential universe of affected anglers included: 24,664 HMS Angling category permit holders; 4,140 HMS Charter/ Headboat category permit holders, and 4,345 General category permit holders. All of the aforementioned permit holders are eligible to participate in registered Atlantic HMS tournaments.

Section 604(a)(4) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires the Agency to describe the projected reporting, record keeping, and other compliance requirements of the final rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which would be subject to the requirements of the report or record. None of the alternatives considered for this final rule would result in additional reporting, recordkeeping, and compliance requirements.

Section 604(a)(5) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires the Agency to describe the steps taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes. NMFS believes that this final rule minimizes impacts on small entities by temporarily suspending circle hook requirements for HMS tournaments, to allow participants additional time to become proficient in the use of circle hooks and familiar with their ecological benefits. The alternative to permanently suspend the circle hook requirement would not achieve MSA rebuilding objectives for these fisheries.

As described below, NMFS considered three alternatives in this final rulemaking and provides justification for selection of the preferred alternative to achieve the desired objective.

The alternatives considered included: maintain existing non-offset circle hook requirements for anglers fishing from HMS permitted vessels and participating in Atlantic billfish tournaments (alternative 1, No Action); suspend non-offset circle hook

requirements for anglers fishing from HMS permitted vessels and participating in Atlantic billfish tournaments through December 31, 2007 (alternative 2, preferred alternative); and, remove Atlantic billfish tournament circle hook requirements and promote voluntary use of circle hooks by tournament anglers (alternative 3).

Alternative 1 is considered the no action alternative since it would maintain unchanged the Atlantic billfish circle hook regulations that were implemented on January 1, 2007. This alternative is not preferred because, in part, it is less likely to improve long-term compliance with circle hook regulations, and thus be less likely to maximize post-release survival of Atlantic billfish than the preferred alternative because it does not provide adequate time for anglers to familiarize themselves with circle hooks and increase angler's acceptance of them. Alternative 1, the No Action alternative, would have no new economic impacts beyond those that were included in previous rulemaking. Alternative 2 could result in a minor short-term increase in billfish tournament participation given the perceptions held by many anglers that J-hooks may increase the odds of landing a billfish. No additional costs for billfish tournament participants are likely because NMFS anticipates that anglers already possess J-hook related tackle, as this was the standard gear used in the fishery prior to January 1, 2007, and is still authorized for use outside of billfish tournaments.

Alternative 3 was considered, but not fully analyzed in the Environmental Assessment because voluntary promotion of circle hook use in the years prior to implementation of the circle hook regulation on January 1, 2007, did not achieve a high percentage of recreational angler use of circle hooks in the Atlantic billfish fishery. As such, NMFS does not anticipate that continued promotion of voluntary circle hook use alone by tournament anglers would result in achieving the maximum conservation benefit possible of reduced post-release mortality of Atlantic billfish relative to the no action alternative. Alternative 3 could result in minor short-term increases in angler consumer surplus and/or willingness to pay, as anglers may perceive that their short-term catch rates of Atlantic billfish may increase with the use of J-hooks. However, alternative 3 would not be expected to increase either consumer surplus or willingness to pay in the long-term as it would result in an increase in post-release hooking mortality and thus be less likely to contribute to rebuilding of Atlantic billfish populations. For the reasons discussed above, this alternative was not selected as the preferred alternative.

Alternative 2 may result in minor increases in printing and distribution costs to tournament operators if tournament rules need to be reprinted and redistributed. Tournaments could avoid additional printing costs if they voluntarily chose to maintain an all circle hook tournament format, which some tournaments have notified NMFS that they will do. There may be a long-term increase in angler consumer surplus resulting from rebuilding efforts through either alternatives 1 or 2, and therefore resulting in a potential increase in demand for billfish tournament participation. However, these benefits may be realized sooner under alternative 2, should it lead to increased acceptance and use of circle hooks. As such, and based on the analysis included in the EA for this rulemaking, alternative 2 was selected the preferred alternative.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 635

Fish, Fisheries, Fishing, Fishing vessels, Management.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

William T. Hogarth

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

■ For reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 635 is amended as follows:

PART 635—ATLANTIC HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 635 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.*; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 635.21, paragraph (e)(2)(iii) is suspended from May 11, 2007 to December 31, 2007, and is revised effective January 1, 2008, to read as follows:

§ 635.21 Gear operation and deployment restrictions.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(2) * * *

(iii) After December 31, 2007, persons who have been issued or are required to be issued a permit under this part and who are participating in a ''tournament'', as defined in § 635.2, that bestows points, prizes, or awards for Atlantic billfish must deploy only non-offset circle hooks when using natural bait or natural bait/artificial lure combinations, and may not deploy a J-hook or an offset circle hook in combination with natural bait or a natural bait/artificial lure combination.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. E7–9097 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 72, No. 91
Friday, May 11, 2007

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

7 CFR Part 1738

RIN 0572–AC06

Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Rural Utilities Service, an agency delivering the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Rural Development Utilities Programs, hereinafter referred to as Rural Development, proposes to amend its regulation for the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program (Broadband Loan Program). Since the Broadband Loan Program's inception, the Agency has faced and continues to face significant challenges in administering the program, including the fierce competitive nature of the broadband market, the fact that many companies proposing to offer broadband service are start-up organizations with limited resources, continually evolving technology, and economic factors such as the higher cost of serving rural communities. Because of these challenges, the Agency has been reviewing the characteristics of the Broadband Loan Program and has determined that modifications are required to accelerate the deployment of broadband service to the rural areas of the country. Therefore, this rulemaking proposes to implement changes on the following subject matter: funding in competitive markets and new eligibility requirements; new equity and market survey requirements; and new legal notice requirements to increase transparency.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments by either of the following methods:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and, in the lower ''Search Regulations and Federal Actions'' box, select ''Rural Utilities Service'' from the agency drop-down menu, then click on ''Submit.'' In the Docket ID column, select RUS–06–Agency–0052 to submit or view public comments and to view supporting and related materials available electronically. Information on using Regulations.gov, including instructions for accessing documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket after the close of the comment period, is available through the site's ''User Tips'' link.

• *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Please send your comment addressed to Michele Brooks, Acting Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, USDA Rural Development, 1400 Independence Avenue, STOP 1522, Room 5159, Washington, DC 20250–1522. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. RUS–06–Agency–0052.

Other Information: Additional information about Rural Development and its programs is available on the Internet at *http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/index.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Claffey, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Telecommunications Program, Rural Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., STOP 1590, Room 4056, Washington, DC 20250–1590. Telephone number (202) 720–9554, Facsimile (202) 720–0810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12866

This proposed rule has been determined to be significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). In accordance with Executive Order 12866, an Economic Impact Analysis was completed, outlining the costs and benefits of implementing this program in rural America. The complete analysis is available from Rural Development upon request.

Executive Order 12988

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. Rural Development has determined that this rule meets the applicable standards provided in section 3 of that Executive Order. In addition, all State and local laws and regulations that are in conflict with this rule will be preempted. No retroactive effect will be given to the rule and, in accordance with section 212(e) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6912(e)), administrative appeal procedures must be exhausted before an action against the Department or its agencies may be initiated.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) is not applicable to this proposed rule because the Agency is not required by 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law to publish a notice of proposed rulemaking for the subject matter of this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act and E-Government Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended), Rural Development invites comments on this information collection for which approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will be requested.

Comments on this notice must be received by July 10, 2007.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumption used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to 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 on other forms of information technology.

Comments may be sent to Michele Brooks, Acting Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Stop 1522, Room 5159 South Building, Washington, DC 20250–1522.

Title: 7 CFR Part 1738, Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees.

OMB Control Number: 0572–0130.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved information collection package.

Abstract: Rural Development is authorized by Title VI, Rural Broadband Access, of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (RE Act), to provide loans and loan guarantees to fund the cost of construction, improvement, or acquisition of facilities and equipment for the provision of broadband service in eligible rural communities in States and Territories of the United States. Title VI of the RE Act requires that Rural Development make or guarantee a loan only if there is reasonable assurance that the loan, together with all outstanding loans and obligations of the borrower will be repaid in full within the time agreed. The items covered by this collection include forms and related documentation to support a loan application, including Form 532 and supporting documentation.

Revisions to the information collection include: (1) Funding in competitive markets and new eligibility requirements (revisions will affect the details of an application, but not the difficulty of preparation or quantity of information provided; accordingly, the paperwork burden associated with these changes is not expected to be appreciably more or less than under the existing rule); (2) new equity requirements (revisions will affect the details of an application, but not the difficulty of preparation or quantity of information provided; accordingly, the paperwork burden associated with these changes is not expected to be appreciably more or less than under the existing rule); (3) new market survey requirements (the associated paperwork burden will be reduced by a small amount for some applicants as the requirement will be eliminated in certain instances); and (4) new legal notice requirements to increase transparency (the additional information required by the proposed modification of legal notice requirement will increase the paperwork burden of each application by a small amount).

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to average 225 hours per response.

Respondents: Businesses and not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 40.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 2.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 13,480 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Michele Brooks, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, at (202) 690–1078.

All responses to this information collection and recordkeeping notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record. Rural Development is committed to the E-Government Act, which requires Government agencies in general to provide the public the option of submitting information or transacting business electronically to the maximum extent possible.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

The program described by this proposed rule is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs under No. 10.886, Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees. This catalog is available on a subscription basis from the Superintendent of Documents, the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Telephone: (202) 512–1800 or at *http://www.cfda.gov.*

Executive Order 12372

This proposed rule is excluded from the scope of Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Consultation, which may require consultation with State and local officials. See the final rule related notice entitled ''Department Programs and Activities Excluded from Executive Order 12372,'' (50 FR 47034).

Unfunded Mandates

This proposed rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provision of Title II of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995) for State, local, and tribal governments or the private sector. Thus, this rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995.

National Environmental Policy Act Certification

Rural Development has determined that this proposed rule will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*). Therefore, this action does not require an environmental impact statement or assessment.

Background

Contents

A. Introduction
B. Regulatory History
C. Program Results
D. Program Improvements
E. Review of Rules and Processes
F. Proposed Rule Changes

A. Introduction: The Utilities Programs (the Agency) of USDA Rural Development improve the quality of life in rural America by providing investment capital for deployment of rural telecommunications infrastructure. Financial assistance is provided to rural utilities; municipalities; commercial corporations; limited liability companies; public utility districts; Indian tribes; and cooperative, nonprofit, limited-dividend, or mutual associations. In order to achieve the goal of increasing economic opportunity in rural America, USDA Rural Development finances infrastructure that enables access to a seamless, nation-wide telecommunications network. With access to the same advanced telecommunications networks as its urban counterparts, especially broadband networks designed to accommodate distance learning, telework and telemedicine, rural America will eventually see improving educational opportunities, health care, economies, safety and security, and ultimately higher employment. The Agency shares the assessment of Congress, State and local officials, industry representatives, and rural residents that broadband service is a critical component to the future of rural America. The Agency is committed to ensuring that rural America will have access to affordable, reliable, broadband services, and to provide a healthy, safe and prosperous place to live and work.

B. Regulatory History: On May 13, 2002, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, Public Law 107–171 ''Farm Bill'' was signed into law. The Farm Bill amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to include Title VI, the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program (Broadband Loan Program), to be administered by the Agency. Title VI authorized the Agency to approve loans and loan guarantees for the costs of construction, improvement, and acquisition of facilities and equipment for broadband service in eligible rural communities. Under the Farm Bill, the Agency was directed to promulgate regulations without public comment within 120 days from passage. Implementing the program required a different lending approach for the Agency than it employed in its earlier telephone program because of the unregulated, highly competitive, and technologically diverse nature of the broadband market. The current regulations were published on January 30, 2003.

C. Program Results: Despite the challenges in implementing this new program, significant progress has been made in facilitating rural broadband deployment. As of March 15, 2007, the Agency approved 68 loans totaling $1.2 billion for broadband deployment projects headquartered in 36 states. Eight of those projects are completed in Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, North Dakota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Texas and Washington. The remainder of the projects are in various stages of construction or planning. Through these loans, more than half a million households in more than 1,000 rural communities will receive broadband service. Approximately 40 percent of these communities had no broadband service at the time the loan was approved, and an additional 20 percent had limited access to broadband services.

As mandated by Congress, the program is to be administered in a technology neutral manner. As the results show below, the Agency has achieved that mandate by financing the deployment of a wide array of technologies capable of meeting the needs of rural communities:

Technology	Number of loans approved*
Broadband over Powerline	1
Digital Subscriber Line	15
Wireless	18
Hybrid Fiber Coax	12
Optical Fiber	27

*Applications deploying multiple technologies counted in each category.

In addition to the various types of technology deployments, loans have been made to a very diverse set of organizations using various business models. Nearly 90 percent of loans approved were made to private companies, 7 percent were made to cooperatives, 3 percent were made to municipalities and 1 loan was awarded to a tribal authority.

D. Program Improvements: Since the Broadband Program's inception, many modifications have been made to improve the administration of the program. Specifically, the Agency has created a standardized loan application; a Broadband Credit Committee to evaluate risks in the program; a financial assessment model to measure loan feasibility; and new standardized loan documents to cover the unique attributes of the industry, as well as accommodate private lending from financial markets which were not traditional Agency lending partners.

Moreover, the Agency now encourages applicants to work with Agency local field representatives prior to submitting applications to increase loan processing efficiency. Program outreach efforts have been well received and are in high demand today. To date, the Agency has conducted nearly two dozen awareness sessions with 1,488 attendees nation-wide.

As a result of its efforts, the Agency has seen dramatic improvements in its application processing. The average processing time in 2006 was almost half of what it was in 2003. In addition, to increase program awareness and transparency, modifications have been made to the Agency's Web site to ensure that information is available to potential applicants, potential competitors, and the public.

E. Review of Rules and Processes: While the Agency is proud of the results achieved thus far, it is also aware that improvements to the Broadband Program are necessary. Over the course of the last four years, the Broadband Program has encountered challenges in administering the program and learned from them. The challenges include the competitive nature of the broadband communications industry, the fact that many applicants are start-up organizations with limited resources to meet equity requirements, the rapid pace of technology advancement and increases in demand for bandwidth, and the need for increased transparency in providing communities and incumbent providers with information on new market entrants. Program participants and industry members have since raised concerns with the implementation of the program. The Agency's experience, coupled with input from industry representatives, state and regional associations, and other interested parties, has prompted the Agency to propose amendments to its regulations to address these challenges and other critical issues affecting the deployment of broadband service in rural America. The Agency is, however, still committed to Title VI's direction to give priority to eligible rural communities where broadband service is not available. Further, the Agency is seeking comment on the proposals, which as noted above, will be the first formal opportunity for public comment on the rules associated with the Broadband Program. Specifically, this proposed rule will address: (1) Funding in competitive markets and new eligibility requirements; (2) New equity and market survey requirements; and (3) New legal notice requirements to increase transparency. Further, the program proposes reordering the present rules to make them more user-friendly, and rewording certain rules, without substantively changing them, to clarify their meaning. In addition, the proposed changes codify processes and procedures currently published in Agency guides (*i.e.*, application submission procedures, competitive analysis, reporting requirements, etc.). In order to easily identify which sections have been modified, added, removed, or re-ordered, the following table summarizes the proposed changes:

BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RULES—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Existing section	Proposed new location	Action taken	Proposed content change
Subpart A—	1738.1	Modified	Revised 1738.1(c) to state that "RUS will not assess fees for any loan made under this part".
General:			
§ 1738.1 General statement.			Added reference to agency's web site in paragraph (b).
§ 1738.2 Definitions	1738.2	New and modified definition and additional language at 1738.2(b).	Current text designated (a) and new (b) added. *Modified Definitions—In most cases, definitions were modified for clarification purposes.* Acquisition. Eligible Rural Community. Financial Feasibility. Forecast Period. Interim Construction. Interim Financing. Release of Funds.

BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RULES—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES—Continued

Existing section	Proposed new location	Action taken	Proposed content change
			Deleted Definitions. Broadband pilot. Mortgage. Private Loan Guarantee. RUS Telecommunications borrower. *New Definitions—The Agency has added definitions to clarify existing regulation and support proposed rule modifications.* Advance of Funds. Agency. Arm's Length Transaction. Broadband Loan. Census block. Census block group. Derivative. Eligible Entity. Equity or Net Worth. Existing Broadband Service Provider. Guaranteed Amount Debt Derivative. Guaranteed Amount Equity Derivative. Guaranteed Amount Equivalent. Guaranteed Loan Amount. Guaranteed Loan Note. Guaranteed Loan Portion. Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount. Guaranteed Loan Portion Note. Incumbent Service Provider. Indefeasible Right to Use Agreement (IRU). Loan Guarantee. Loan Guarantee Documents. Pre-Loan Expenses. Security Documents. Telecommunications Loan. Urban Area. Un-guaranteed Amount Equivalent. Un-guaranteed Loan Amount and Un-guaranteed Loan Portion Amount.
Subpart B—Loan Purposes and Basic Policies:			
§ 1738.10 General	1738.1(a)	Modified/relocated	Refinancing language in (b) was moved to 1738.22(e).
	1738.2(a)	.....	Moved and modified text related to economic composite life to 1738.2(a).
§ 1738.11 Availability of broadband service.	1738.33	Modified/relocated	Legal notice language moved to 1738.33.
	1738.61	.....	(a) and (b) (1) through (3) included in new prioritization scheme in 1738.61.
§ 1738.12 Location of facilities.	1738.22(a)	Modified	Clarify eligible items for financing.
§ 1738.13 Allocation of funds.	1738.62	Modified	Condensed original language by citing the RE Act as the guidance for allocating funds.
§ 1738.14 One-time priority for unfunded applications from the broadband pilot program.	Deleted	Deleted	No longer relevant.
§ 1738.15 Priorities	1738.61	Modified	Added new language regarding prioritization of applications in the following order: (1) Applications that include only households that have no broadband access or only one Existing Broadband Service Provider. (2) Applications that include only areas where at least 40 percent of households have no access to Broadband service or access to only one Existing Service provider; (3) All other applications.
	1738.62	.....	Relocated language regarding State and National reserves to 1738.62. Text is reworded to reference the Act.
§ 1738.16 Eligible entities.	1738.2	Relocated/modified	Moved language regarding the types of entities eligible for loans to 1738.2(a).
	1738.20 ..... 1738.21	.....	Moved language regarding eligible entities (existing 1738.16(a) and (b)) to 1738.2(a).

BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RULES—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES—Continued

Existing section	Proposed new location	Action taken	Proposed content change
			Added new section, 1738.21, to detail requirements to serve areas with little or no service: —Start-up operations and new entrants—40% of proposed households in a proposed service area must have access to no or only one existing broadband provider. —Incumbent Service Providers proposing to extend service beyond their existing footprint—40% of proposed households in extended service areas must have access to no or only one existing broadband provider. —Incumbent Service Providers submitting applications solely for the purpose of upgrading existing facilities within Eligible Rural Communities must offer Broadband Service with enhanced features.
§ 1738.17 Civil rights ..	1738.64	Relocated/unmodified	Redesignated as 1738.64 but text is unchanged.
§ 1738.18 Minimum and maximum loan amount.	1738.12	Relocated/modified	Removed reference to plant costs. Moved language from 1738.30(b)(2) regarding annual publication of max/min to this section. Removed language ''maximum loan amounts apply only to an applicant for a direct 4-percent broadband loan'' and made a general statement that the maximum will be set in the NOFA published annually in the FEDERAL REGISTER. This allows the Agency the flexibility to set the maximum level based on current funding levels and portfolio concentration.
§ 1738.19 Facilities financed.	1738.19	Modified/clarified	General reorganization to more clearly define for applicants what is and is not eligible for funding by dividing the two topics into separate sections. Old 1738.19(h) is now in 1738.19(b) and renamed ineligible areas.
	1738.22	.....	*1738.22 Items Eligible to be financed.* 1738.22(a)—new language regarding start-up and overhead costs is a further clarification that these costs are eligible for financing. Although not specified in the earlier rules, these costs were considered part of the construction costs and therefore have been routinely funding in the loan program. 1738.22(b)—new language regarding pre-loan expenses. 1738.22(c)—new language (replacing old 1738–19(b)) limiting the cost of the capital lease for the first 5 years of the loan amortization period. This language was added because the standard period for advancing all funds set in all RUS loan documents is 5 years. Any lease extending beyond that period should not have funds available at that time. 1738.22(d)—new language clarifies the definition of ''necessary and incidental'' that currently exists in 1738.21(c). The common practice of the agency is to interpret this clause as 50%. We have made this standard known in public workshops for several years.
	1738.23	Modified/clarified	1738.23(d)—clarification that funds cannot be used to purchase or acquire the equipment of an affiliate. 1738.23(e)—modified language regarding financing of CPE equipment; applicants often sell the CPE rather than lease it to the end-user. The original intent was that this equipment would be used as collateral; however, because CPE is often physically out of the control of the applicant and because the value of end-user equipment depreciates quickly, we have determined that other arrangements offer the Agency a similar level of security, while offering the applicant more flexibility under our rules. Eliminated old 1738.19(g)—This rule specifically addressed actions the Agency would take prior to October 2004. This rule is outdated and no longer valid.

BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RULES—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES—Continued

Existing section	Proposed new location	Action taken	Proposed content change
§ 1738.20 Credit support requirement.	1738.31	Modified	Now called Equity Requirement and Additional cash requirement.
	1738.32		Added incentive to serve areas with little or no broadband service: reduced initial equity requirement to 10% for applications filing pursuant to 1738.31(a) or (b); 20% equity requirement remains for all other applications. Added clarification on the use of letters of credit and bonds to meet equity requirements. Added language to reserve the Administrator's right to modify or waive the requirements of this section as long as those modifications do not result in a projected negative cash position in any quarter throughout the forecast period and the modifications are required to provide Broadband Service in areas that are not capable of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider. Modified cash requirement language so that cash requirements are considered at time of feasibility determination rather than for eligibility.
§ 1738.21 Interim financing.	1738.60	Relocated/modified	Revised for clarification. No substantive change.
§ 1738.22 Loan security.	1738.41(b) (c) & (d)	Modified	1738.41(b), (c) and (d)—requirement unchanged, reworded to provide further clarity.
	1738.37(e)		Old 1738.22(e) language regarding TIER was moved to financial analysis section—1738.37(e).
Subpart C—Types of Loans:			
§ 1738.30 Rural broadband access loans and loan guarantees.	1738.11	Relocated/modified	Modified original language in 1738(b)(1)(i)(A) to increase the populations test for a 4% loan from 2,500 to 5,000.
	1738.43		Modified original language in 1738.30(b)(1)(i)(B) to be consistent with proposed rules. Language located in 1738.11b(1)(ii) now reads ''is not capable of receiving broadband service or can receive service from only one existing broadband service provider. Deleting original language in 1738.30(b)(1)(ii)—This language was intended to promote service to outlying rural areas because these areas had less access to broadband service. The new proposed regulations will achieve this same goal by requiring most applicants to include a significant portion of service areas with little or no broadband service. Deleting original language in 1738.30(b)(1)(i)(C)—Our experience has demonstrated that this rule was too restrictive and prevented most applicants from qualifying for the 4% funding. The proposed regulations will require most applicants to include service to areas with little or no broadband service. These areas are likely to have lower population density and higher deployment costs. Removing the original restriction in 1738.30(b)(1)(i)(C) will better support deployment to these areas by allowing applicants access to lower cost financing.
	1738.11	Relocated/modified	Current 1738.30(b)(2) has been relocated to 1738.12.
	1738.43		Current rules specific to loan guarantees have been moved to 1738.43
§ 1738.31 Full faith and credit.	1738.43(f)	Relocated/unmodified	Moved to 1738.43(f) without substantial changes.
Subpart D—Terms of Loans:			
§ 1738.40 General	1738.40(a)	Relocated/modified	Current text designated as paragraph (a) and revised to clarify for applicants.
§ 1738.41 Payments on Loans.	1738.42	Relocated/modified	Added language regarding the Administrator's ability to modify requirements on a case-by-case basis for areas that are not capable of receiving or can only receive from one existing broadband provider.

BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RULES—SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Proposed new sections	Subject matter	Proposed content
Subpart D—Loan Application Requirements:		
1738.34	Market Survey	The rules proposed in this section codify existing requirements published in Bulletin 1738–1. Modification of Market Survey Requirement: 1738.34(b) now eliminates the requirement for a market survey if an applicant is projecting less than a 15 percent penetration of the households passed, by the end of the Forecast Period. A detailed competitive analysis is still required for all applications. We are proposing this modification in response to applicants' concerns that the cost of conducting a market survey is a barrier to filing. The Agency has relied more heavily on the competitive analysis and financial and risk analysis to determine project feasibility, and will continue to do so under the new proposal. Added language reserving the Administrator's right to waive the requirements on a case-by-case basis.
1738.35	Competitive analysis	The rules proposed in this section codify existing requirements published in Bulletin 1738–1. Applicants are aware of the requirements and currently comply with them.
1738.36	Business plan	The rules proposed in this section codify existing requirements published in Bulletin 1738–1. Applicants are aware of the requirements and currently comply with them.
1738.37	Financial information	The rules proposed in this section codify existing requirements published in Bulletin 1738–1. Applicants are aware of the requirements and currently comply with them. The proposed rule also allows cash-flow from operations to be used in determination of the cash requirement.
1738.38	System design	The rules proposed in this section codify existing requirements published in Bulletin 1738–1. Applicants are aware of the requirements and currently comply with them. New language reserving the Administrator's right to waive the requirements on a case-by-case basis.
1738.39	Submission of application.	New section that clarifies that applicants are encouraged to submit applications through the General Field Representative in their state for review prior to final submission. Applications will still be accepted at the National Office.
Subpart F—Post Application Procedures:		
1738.50	Notification of completeness.	This new section codifies currently existing internal processes and is designed to help applicants understand the post-application process. We believe this demonstrates the Agency's commitment to a standardized and more transparent process.
1738.51	Determination of feasibility.	This new section codifies currently existing internal processes and is designed to help applicants understand the post-application process. We believe this demonstrates the Agency's commitment to a standardized and more transparent process.
1738.52	Notice to applicant of decision.	This new section codifies currently existing internal processes and is designed to help applicants understand the post-application process. We believe this demonstrates the Agency's commitment to a standardized and more transparent process.
Subpart G—Miscellaneous Requirements and Information:		
1738.63	Annual audit and reporting requirements.	Codifies standard requirements currently existing in broadband loan closing documents. Added language to 1738.63(a) to allow the Administrator to waive the requirement that an audit be performed in the year in which the loan is approved if operations of the applicant have not yet started.
1738.65	Applicable laws	Codifies standard requirements existing in all broadband loan documents.

F. Proposed Rule Changes: The following proposals seek to implement changes to the Broadband Program's regulations regarding: (1) Funding in competitive markets and new eligibility requirements; (2) New equity and market survey requirements; and (3) New legal notice requirements to increase transparency. Through this Notice, the Agency seeks comments on all of these proposed changes from any and all interested parties.

(1) *Funding in competitive markets and new eligibility requirements:* The most intractable problem the Broadband Program has encountered is finding feasible loan applications which propose to serve only rural areas which do not have broadband service. The cost of building out a broadband system coupled with low rural population density in unserved areas has consistently yielded loan proposals which cannot be supported by project revenues. Consequently, in the history of the program, the Agency has certified as complete only one application to serve a rural area completely without broadband service. Uniquely, that application was for an Indian reservation with a very different competitive environment.

In order for broadband loans to be feasible, it is necessary for applicants to serve low cost, more densely populated areas, as well as low density high cost areas. Although it is necessary to serve high density areas which are likely to have broadband service, the Agency proposes to place limitations on service to such areas. The Agency proposes changes in eligibility that would prohibit funding within urban areas, regardless of population, and areas where a significant share of the market is already served by incumbent providers. To accomplish this, the Agency is adding or modifying three definitions, Existing Broadband Service Provider, Eligible Rural Community, and Urban Area, which will identify communities that will be ineligible for funding by establishing that sufficient service is already being provided.

(a) *Existing Broadband Service Provider.* The Agency initially proposes the definition of an existing broadband service provider to identify existing competition. As a basis, the Agency will use the current definition of

''broadband'' established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to determine Incumbent Service Providers that are providing broadband service to the households in the applicant's proposed communities. To be recognized as an Existing Broadband Service Provider, the Incumbent Service Provider must provide evidence and certify to the Agency that 10 percent of the households passed by their facilities are purchasing their broadband service. Using this new definition, funding for any community where there are four or more Existing Broadband Service Provider will be prohibited.

In establishing the benchmark of ''10 percent of households,'' the Agency sought to establish a threshold penetration of the broadband market in any particular community in order to separate broadband service providers who are actively and successfully selling their services from those who are only marginally engaged with a community. The Agency believes that the threshold should differentiate providers who only market to a limited segment of the community (e.g. to businesses, densely populated areas, apartment buildings, etc.) so that a community is not treated as having service available from a provider who does not, in fact, serve all types of customers, throughout its service territory.

Nationwide, slightly more than 40 percent of households are subscribing to broadband service. This number was determined by using the FCC's report entitled ''High-Speed Services for Internet Access: Status as of June 30, 2006'' and comparing the number of residential Advanced Services Lines (45.9 million) with the number of households in the country. The FCC report indicates that the two major technologies providing broadband service are cable modem (59.9%) and DSL (36.0%). In most rural communities, these two types of service are offered by two providers, the incumbent local cable company and the incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC). For example, assuming that a particular community meets the national average penetration percentage of 40.9 percent and further assuming that there are only two providers supplying these services in the same proportions as the national data reflect, the percentage of households served by these two providers would be 24.5 percent and 14.7 percent for the cable company and the ILEC, respectively. This example reflects an idealized estimate. Nonetheless, looking to the idealized case for guidance indicates that setting a threshold at 20 percent of the households in a market (roughly half of the average penetration) might well eliminate all but one provider in a market. Even a 15 percent threshold seems high, since nationwide, DSL does not yet reach that penetration. Therefore, we propose a threshold of 10 percent of the households in a market. A company offering broadband service will need to have a customer base of at least 10 percent of the households in a community in order to be considered an Existing Broadband Service Provider for the purposes of this proposed rule

(b) *Urban Area.* In addition to identifying competition, the Agency proposes limiting eligibility of those communities that qualify under the regulations as rural in population, but are located within the boundaries of an Urban Area. The Agency believes that using the pre-established definition of Urban Area will clarify exactly which communities are eligible and reduce the number of ''urban-like'' communities that technically qualify in population size but are not representative of rural in most other characteristics.

(c) *Eligible Rural Community.* Tying together the preceding two concepts, then, the Agency proposes that an Eligible Rural Community mean a community which contains less than four Existing Broadband Service Providers and is not located in an Urban Area. This modification recognizes that, where there are four or more existing providers, the market is sufficiently served and does not warrant an additional market entrant subsidized through Federal funding.

In addition, the Agency continues to prioritize deployment of Broadband Service to households with no or limited broadband access while ensuring the financial feasibility of loans. To accomplish this, the Agency will require applications from new market entrants, start-ups or incumbent providers that are expanding their service area, to enter areas where 40 percent of households either have no or limited access to Broadband Service. This requirement addresses the need to reach unserved or underserved areas while also permitting service to more lucrative areas, which may be served by up to three Existing Service Providers, in order to attract feasible loan proposals which are supportable from project revenues. Permitting service in areas with up to three Existing Service Providers addresses the need for applicants to leverage revenues from lower-cost users (typically those in more densely populated areas within a city or town) in order to provide service to rural households in higher cost areas, while excluding areas with higher levels of competition where loan feasibility is unlikely.

Lastly, the Agency's proposed rule includes loans to incumbent providers to upgrade existing facilities without requiring service to additional customers as long as the upgrades enhance existing Broadband Service. For purposes of determining whether the proposed service area has ''four or more'' Existing Service Providers, thereby disqualifying the area from lending consideration, the applicant will not be considered as an Existing Broadband Service Provider. Therefore, a facility upgrade loan may be made to an applicant operating in an area which has three other Existing Broadband Service Providers.

The Agency believes that this approach will benefit rural residents by allowing incumbents to keep pace with the changing needs of their customers through continued advancement in technologies and services

(2) *New equity and market survey requirements:* Two requirements of the Broadband Program have significantly precluded applicants from being eligible for a Broadband loan, the equity requirement and the market survey requirement. In response, the Agency is modifying both requirements so as to provide incentives for serving markets with limited or no broadband service and to reduce the costs to applicants under certain circumstances.

(a) *§ 1738.31 Equity requirement:* Under the current rules, to be eligible for a loan, applicants must have a 20 percent (of the requested loan amount) credit support contribution and in some instances, cash equal to the first full year's operations. The concept of credit support was unique to the Agency and has been a source of confusion for many applicants. In an effort to better clarify its requirements, the Agency is proposing to replace the credit support methodology with a straight forward equity requirement, mirroring private industry.

With this proposed rule modification, the Agency is also addressing our applicants' challenges in obtaining private investment capital to provide service in less lucrative, rural markets, particularly those with no broadband service or service from only one provider. A significant number of applicants, many of whom are start-ups, have noted that private financing for these areas is limited and difficult to obtain. Further, applicants assert that the current equity requirement proves too burdensome and serves as a barrier to entities seeking to serve these markets. The Agency's records generally support this assertion. Of the 106

applications returned since the Program's inception, more than half were returned for lack of credit support. Therefore, the Agency is proposing to reduce its equity requirement from 20 percent to 10 percent of the requested loan amount for applicants proposing to serve an area wherein at least 40 percent of the households have no broadband access or service from only one provider. The Agency proposes that all other applicants be required to demonstrate a minimum equity position equal to 20 percent of the requested loan amount at the time the application is submitted.

(b) *§ 1738.33 Market survey:* Currently, the Agency uses market surveys, competitive assessments and financial analyses as tools to validate subscriber projections and determine loan feasibility. Applicants have asserted that completing a market survey can prove to be onerous, unnecessary, and cost prohibitive, especially for those seeking to serve areas where no service exists. Based on our experience with the program, the Agency finds that most market surveys submitted support a 15 percent penetration rate. As a result, the Agency relies more heavily on other means, such as the detailed competitive and financial analyses, to determine feasibility for areas where 15 percent or less penetration is projected. Therefore, in communities where an applicant is proposing to serve less than 15 percent of the market, the Agency is proposing to eliminate the requirement for a market survey, but continue to require submission of competitive and financial analyses.

(3) *New legal notice requirements to increase transparency:* The Agency is also proposing to modify the Legal Notice requirement of § 1738.32 to improve information to customers, existing service providers, and applicants. This requirement of the existing rule was designed to: (i) Identify areas with no existing Broadband Service for priority consideration, (ii) notify communities of the potential entrant of a new service provider, and (iii) provide incumbent service providers with an opportunity to describe their current service territory and service offerings, market share, etc. The concept of the legal notice is well intended and, the Agency believes, still necessary and useful to the Agency in making lending decisions. However, based on past experience, the current process needs to be modified. The Agency proposes further modifications to increase transparency, reach a broader range of interested parties, and provide more detailed information on the extent of broadband deployment by incumbent providers. To address concerns with timely access to legal notices, the Agency is proposing to establish a clearly defined window for posting of the notices. Specifically, the legal notice will be published on the Agency's webpage after the application has been received in the Agency's national office and will remain on the webpage for a period of 30 working days. The notice must set forth the applicant's total proposed service area, including a service area map. An applicant will also need to indicate if it is proposing voice and video services, in addition to the present requirement of its intention to provide data services. This will increase the transparency of the new application to the incumbent provider, as well as alert customers to potential new service offerings.

In response to the Legal Notice, incumbent providers will have new responsibilities as well. The Legal Notice will now request any Incumbent Service Provider to submit to the Agency the following information (within 30 days of notice posting) on the number of customers: (i) Capable of receiving Broadband Service in the applicant's proposed service area; (ii) purchasing Broadband Service in the applicant's proposed service area (including the rates of data transmission being offered, and the cost of each level of Broadband Service); and (iii) receiving other services that will be offered in the applicant's proposed service area and the associated rates for these other services. An incumbent will also be requested to submit a map of its service territory.

It is important that the Agency receive this information, as it will be used by the Agency to determine if the incumbent will be classified as an Existing Broadband Service Provider, and ultimately whether an Eligible Rural Community is eligible for funding. If, however, an incumbent does not submit a response to the legal notice within the applicable time period, it will not be considered an Existing Broadband Service Provider for the purpose of determining applicant eligibility. Nonetheless, the incumbent will still be considered in the lending decision as a competitor. All proprietary and confidential information submitted by the incumbent will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1738

Broadband, Loan programs-communications, Rural areas, Telephone, Telecommunications.

For reasons set out in the preamble, the Agency proposes to amend chapter XVII of title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations by revising part 1738 to read as follows:

PART 1738—RURAL BROADBAND ACCESS LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES

Subpart —General

Sec.
1738.1 General.
1738.2 Definitions.
1738.3—1738.9 [Reserved]

Subpart B—Types of Loans

1738.10 General.
1738.11 Broadband Loans and Loan Guarantees.
1738.12 Minimum and maximum loan amounts.
1738.13–1738.18 [Reserved]

Subpart C— Ineligible Areas, Eligible Entities and Eligible/Not Eligible Items

1738.19 Ineligible areas.
1738.20 Eligible entities.
1738.21 Service requirement for proposed projects.
1738.22 Items eligible to be financed.
1738.23 Items not eligible to be financed.
1738.24–1738.29 [Reserved]

Subpart D—Loan Application Requirements

1738.30 General.
1738.31 Equity requirement.
1738.32 Additional cash requirements.
1738.33 Legal notice.
1738.34 Market survey.
1738.35 Competitive analysis.
1738.36 Business plan.
1738.37 Financial information.
1738.38 System design.
1738.39 Submission of the application.

Subpart E—Terms for Loans and Loan Guarantees

1738.40 Direct 4 Percent and Cost of Money Loans.
1738.41 Loan security.
1738.42 Payments on loans.
1738.43 Loan guarantees.
1738.44–1738.49 [Reserved]

Subpart F—Post-Application Procedures

1738.50 Notification of completeness.
1738.51 Determination of feasibility.
1738.52 Notice to applicant on decision.
1738.53–1738.59 [Reserved]

Subpart G—Miscellaneous Requirements and Information

1738.60 Interim financing and construction.
1738.61 Priority for processing loan applications.
1738.62 Allocation of funds.
1738.63 Annual audit and reporting requirements.
1738.64 Applicable laws.
1738.65–1738.99 [Reserved]
1738.100 OMB control number.

Authority: Pub. L. 107–171, 7 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*

Subpart A—General

§ 1738.1 General statement.

(a) This part sets forth the general policies, types of loans and loan guarantees, and program requirements under the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program to provide funds on a technology neutral basis for the costs of construction, improvement, and acquisition of facilities and equipment for broadband service in eligible rural communities.

(b) Additional information regarding the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program can be found in Bulletin 1738–1, ''Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Application Guide'' and Bulletin 1738–2, ''Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Advance and Construction Procedures Guide.'' These bulletins are located on the Agency's Web page: *http://www.usda.gov/rus/telecom/broadband.htm.* or you can contact Kenneth Kuchno, Director, Broadband Division at the following address for copies: Stop 1599, South Agriculture Building, Room 2868, Washington , DC 20250.(c) No fees or charges will be assessed for any loan made under this part.

§ 1738.2 Definitions.

(a) As used in this part:

Acquisition means the purchase of assets that will be used to provide Broadband Service, such as by acquiring facilities, equipment, operations, licenses, or majority stock interest of one or more organizations. Stock acquisitions must be arms-length transactions.

Administrator means the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service (RUS), or his or her designee.

Advance of Funds means the transfer of loan funds from the Agency to the borrower.

Affiliate or *Affiliated Company* of any specified entity means any other entity directly or indirectly controlling of, controlled by, under direct or indirect common control with, or related to, such specified entity. For the purpose of this definition, ''control'' of any specified entity means the power to direct the management and policies of such specified entity, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of stock, by contract, or otherwise.

Agency shall mean the Rural Utilities Service, which administers the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Rural Development Utilities Programs.

Applicant means an eligible entity requesting approval of a loan or loan guarantee under this part.

Arms-Length Transaction means a transaction between two related or affiliated parties that is conducted as if they were unrelated, so that there is no question of conflict of interest, or a transaction between two otherwise unrelated or unaffiliated parties.

Borrower means any organization that has an outstanding Broadband or Telecommunications loan made or guaranteed by the Agency.

Broadband Loan means any loan approved under Title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (RE Act).

Broadband Service means any technology identified by the administrator as having the capacity to transmit data to enable a subscriber to the service to originate and receive high quality voice, data, graphics and video. To qualify as broadband service, the project must offer data transmission services and may provide voice, graphics, video and other services. The Agency will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** defining the minimum rate-of-data transmission criteria to qualify as broadband service during that fiscal year's funding period.

Census block means an area normally bounded by visible features, such as streets, streams, and railroads, and by nonvisible features, such as the boundary of an incorporated place, minor civil division, county, or other tabulation entity as described in the latest decennial census.

Census block group means a group of census blocks within a census tract whose numbers begin with the same digit; for example, BG 3 within a census tract includes all census blocks numbered from 3000 to 3999.

Composite economic life means the weighted (by dollar amount of each class of facility in the loan) average economic life of all classes of facilities in the loan.

Derivative means any right, interest, instrument or security issued or traded on the credit of the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion, including but not limited to any participation share of, or undivided ownership or other equity interest in, the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion; any note, bond or other debt instrument or obligation which is collateralized or otherwise secured by a pledge of, or security interest in, the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion; or any such interest in such an interest or any such instrument secured by such an instrument.

Economic life means the estimated useful service life of an asset as determined by the Agency.

Eligible entity means a cooperative, nonprofit or for-profit corporation, limited dividend or mutual association, limited liability company, Indian tribe, tribal organization as defined in 25 U.S.C. 450b (b) and (c), state or local government, including any agency, subdivision, or instrumentality thereof (including consortia thereof). In addition, the entity must have sufficient authority to enter into a contract with the Agency and to carry out the purposes of the proposed loan. Individuals, partnerships of individuals, and entities that serve more than 2 percent of the telephone subscriber lines installed in the United States are not eligible entities.

Eligible Rural Community means any area, as confirmed by the latest decennial census of the Bureau of the Census, which is not located within:

(1) The boundaries of an Urban Area;

(2) An incorporated city or town with a population of more than 20,000; or

(3) An area that has four or more Existing Broadband Service Providers (excluding the applicant).

Equity or Net Worth means Total Assets minus Total Liabilities. For example, the sum of the balances of the following accounts of the applicant: Capital Stock or Membership Units, Additional Paid-In-Capital, Treasury Stock, Other Capital, and Retained Earnings.

Existing Broadband Service Provider means an Incumbent Service Provider that is providing Broadband Service, and is able to provide evidence and certify to the Agency that 10 percent of the households passed by their facilities are purchasing their Broadband Service. Resellers of Broadband Service who utilize the physical facilities of other service providers to deliver their products to the subscriber will not be considered as an Existing Broadband Service Provider.

Feasibility study means the pro forma financial analysis prepared by the Agency, based on the financial projections supplied by the applicant and found acceptable by the Agency, to determine the financial feasibility of a loan.

Financial feasibility means the ability of an applicant to generate sufficient revenues to cover its expenses and service its debt and meet the minimum TIER requirement of 1.25 by the end of the Forecast Period.

Fiscal year means the fiscal year of the Federal Government (October 1 to September 30).

Forecast period means the time period used in the feasibility study to determine if an application is financially feasible. Financial feasibility of a loan application is usually based on 5-year projections.

Guaranteed-Amount Debt Derivative means any note, bond or other debt instrument or obligation which is collateralized or otherwise secured by a pledge of, or security interest in, the Guaranteed Loan Note or any Guaranteed Loan Portion Note or any Derivative, as the case may be, which has an exclusive or preferred claim to the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be.

Guaranteed-Amount Equity Derivative means any participation share of, or undivided ownership or other equity interest in, the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion or any Derivative, as the case may be, which has an exclusive or preferred claim to the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be.

Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent means, with respect to any Derivative which is equal in principal amount to the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion, that amount of payment on account of such Derivative which is equal to the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount, as the case may be; or with respect to any Derivative which in the aggregate are equal in principal amount to the Guaranteed Loan or any Guaranteed Loan Portion, that amount of payment on account of such derivatives which is equal to the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount, as the case may be.

Guaranteed Loan Amount means that amount of payment on account of the Guaranteed Loan which is guaranteed under the terms of the Guarantee.

Guaranteed Loan Note means, collectively, the note or notes executed and delivered by the Borrower to evidence the Guaranteed Loan.

Guaranteed Loan Portion means any portion of the Guaranteed Loan.

Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount means that amount of payment on account of any Guaranteed Loan Portion which is guaranteed under the terms of the Guarantee.

Guaranteed Loan Portion Note means any note executed and delivered by the Borrower to evidence a Guaranteed Loan Portion.

Incumbent service provider means an existing entity that is currently providing data, voice, video and/or graphic services in the applicant's proposed service area.

Indefeasible Right to Use Agreement (IRU) means the effective long-term lease of a portion of the capacity of a cable, specified in terms of a certain number of channels of a given bandwidth.

Initial loan means the first loan made under the RE Act to a Borrower.

Interim construction means the construction, improvement, or acquisition of facilities and equipment proposed to be funded by loan funds, which occurs after the application is deemed complete by the Agency.

Interim financing means funding for the Interim construction.

Loan means any loan made or guaranteed under this part by the Agency, unless otherwise noted.

Loan contract means the loan agreement between the Agency and the borrower, including all amendments thereto.

Loan documents mean the loan contract, note, and security instrument between the borrower and the Agency and any associated documents pertaining to a loan once the loan is approved for financing.

Loan funds mean funds provided pursuant to a loan made or guaranteed under this part by the Agency.

Loan guarantee means a loan made by another lender and guaranteed by the Agency.

Loan guarantee documents mean the guarantee agreement, the loan contract between the guaranteed lender and the Borrower, the loan note guarantee, the Guaranteed Loan Note, and the Security Documents.

Pre-loan expenses means the expenses associated with the preparation of a loan application. These expenses include costs associated with the legal notice, market survey, competitive analysis, financial analysis, environmental report, engineering design, and required legal opinions. Pre-loan expenses must be fully supported and acceptable to the Agency if they are to be considered for funding.

RE Act means the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*).

Release of funds means the availability of loan funds to be advanced for approved purposes.

RUS means the Rural Utilities Service, an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, and successor to the Rural Electrification Administration.

Security Documents mean any mortgage, security agreement, and/or financing statement, or other documents which grants to the Agency a security interest, including any amendments and supplements thereto.

Service area means the geographical area within which the applicant proposes to make Broadband Service available with a loan provided under this part.

Telecommunications means the transmission and reception of voice, data, sounds, signals, pictures, writings, or signs of all kinds, by wire, fiber, radio, light, or other visual or electromagnetic means.

Telecommunications loan means any telecommunication loan made under Title II, III, IV or VI of the RE Act.

TIER means Times Interest Earned Ratio. TIER is the ratio of an applicant's net income (after taxes) plus (adding back) interest expense, all divided by interest expense.

Total Assets means the sum of the balances of the following accounts of the applicant: Current Assets, Non Current-Assets, and Total Plant, minus the following accounts of the applicant: Accumulated Depreciation and Accumulated Amortization.

Unguaranteed-amount equivalent means all amounts of payment on account of any Derivative other than the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent.

Unguaranteed loan amount means all amounts of payment on account of the Guaranteed Loan other than the Guaranteed Amount.

Unguaranteed loan portion amount means all amounts of payment on account of any Guaranteed Loan Portion other than the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount.

Urban Area means, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, all territory, population, and housing units located within an urbanized area (UA) or an urban cluster (UC).

(b) Accounting terms not otherwise defined in this part shall have the definition ascribed to them under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

§§ 1738.3–1738.9 [Reserved]

Subpart B—Types of Loans

§ 1738.10 General.

Financial assistance under the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program shall be in the form of a Direct Cost-of-Money loan, a Direct 4 Percent Loan, and/or a Loan Guarantee to provide Broadband Service in Eligible Rural Communities.

§ 1738.11 Broadband Loans and Loan Guarantees.

Broadband Loans and Loan Guarantees shall consist of one or more of the following three types of financial assistance:

(a) *Direct Cost-of-Money,* which shall bear interest at a rate (the ''Cost-of-Money Interest Rate'') equal to the cost of borrowing to the Department of Treasury for obligations of comparable maturity. The Cost-of-Money Interest Rate will be supplied by the Agency each time funds are actually advanced to the Borrower.

(b) *Direct 4 Percent,* which shall bear an interest rate of 4 percent on any advance to the Borrower.

(1) To be eligible for a direct loan bearing an interest rate of 4 percent, the applicant must propose serving an Eligible Rural Community that:

(i) Has a population of less than 5,000 inhabitants; and

(ii) Is not currently capable of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider.

(iii) Is located in a county with per capita personal income that is less than or equal to that percent of the national per capita personal income which the Agency will publish in the **Federal Register** at the beginning of each fiscal year. County per capita income is published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce, at *http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/reis/.* The Agency will use the most recent statistics published on October 1 of the fiscal year in which the application is deemed complete by the Agency.

(2) When an approved application exceeds the maximum amount of 4 percent financing that may be available to the Borrower, a direct loan made at 4 percent may be made simultaneously with a Cost-of-Money Interest Rate loan.

(3) A 4 percent loan may be made simultaneously with a Cost-of-Money Interest Rate loan or a private loan guarantee.

(c) *Loan Guarantee,* which shall bear interest at a rate, set by the guaranteed lender that must be consistent with the then applicable market rate for loans of comparable amounts and maturities.

§ 1738.12 Minimum and maximum loan amounts.

Applications for loans or loan guarantees of less than $100,000 will not be considered. The maximum of any single type of loan or loan combination will be published in the **Federal Register** at the beginning of each fiscal year.

§§ 1738.13–1738.18 [Reserved]

Subpart C—Ineligible Areas, Eligible Entities and Eligible/Ineligible Items

§ 1738.19 Ineligible areas.

The Agency will not approve the use of a broadband loan:

(a) To more than one applicant to provide Broadband Service within the same Eligible Rural Community; or

(b) To an applicant proposing to provide Broadband Service in an Eligible Rural Community where an existing Borrower is already providing Broadband Service.

§ 1738.20 Eligible entities.

Only Eligible Entities which propose providing Broadband Services in Eligible Rural Communities shall be eligible for a Broadband Loan.

§ 1738.21 Service requirements for proposed projects.

(a) A project in an area not currently served by the applicant must:

(1) Be in an Eligible Rural Community.

(2) Contain at least 40 percent of households with no access to Broadband Service or access to only one Existing Broadband Service Provider. (For example, if a start-up company or new entrant submits a loan application to provide Broadband Service to 1000 households, 400 (1000 × 40%) of the households must have no broadband access or have access to only one Existing Broadband Service Provider. Likewise, if an Incumbent Service Provider submits a loan application to provide Broadband Service to 2000 households in its existing service territory and 1000 households outside of its existing territory, 400 (1000 × 40%) of the households outside its existing service territory must have no broadband access or have access to only one Existing Broadband Service Provider.)

(b) Applications submitted by Incumbent Service Providers solely for the purpose of upgrading existing facilities in Eligible Rural Communities must enhance existing service by providing or improving Broadband Service and other services related thereto.

(c) Areas that are being acquired from an Incumbent Service Provider will be considered existing service areas of the applicant.

§ 1738.22 Items eligible to be financed.

The proceeds of any loan made under this part may be used:

(a) To fund the construction, improvement, and acquisition of all facilities, wherever located, required to provide Broadband Service to Eligible Rural Communities, including facilities required for providing other services over the same facilities that Broadband Services are being provided. Start-up and overhead costs that can be capitalized and included as part of the cost of facilities required to provide Broadband Service are eligible for financing.

(b) To fund Pre-Loan Expenses not to exceed 5 percent of the requested total Broadband Loan amount, excluding any amounts requested to refinance outstanding telecommunication loans.

(c) To finance facilities to provide Broadband Service leased under the terms of a capital lease as defined in generally accepted accounting principles. Loan funds will be limited to the cost of the capital lease for the first 5 years of the loan amortization period.

(d)(1) To finance an Acquisition, provided that:

(i) The Acquisition is necessary for furnishing or improving rural Broadband Service;

(ii) The acquired Service Area, if any, is in an Eligible Rural Community; and

(iii) Funds provided for the Acquisition do not exceed 50 percent of the approved loan amount.

(2) For the purposes of the Acquisition, the applicant will be considered the Incumbent Service Provider with regard to the acquired Service Area, if any.

(e) To refinance an outstanding obligation of an applicant on another Telecommunications Loan made under the RE Act if the use of the proceeds realized will further the construction, improvement, or acquisition of facilities for the provision of Broadband Service in Eligible Rural Communities, provided that:

(1) Funds used for refinancing may not constitute more than 40 percent of the loan;

(2) The amortization period for the funds associated with the refinancing of outstanding obligations cannot exceed the remaining amortization period of the notes being refinanced. If multiple notes are being refinanced, an average remaining amortization period will be calculated based on the weighted dollar average of the notes being refinanced; and

(3) The Applicant must be current with payments on the notes to be refinanced.

§ 1738.23 Items not eligible to be financed.

The proceeds of any loan made under this part cannot be used:

(a) To fund the costs associated with facilities covered by an Indefeasible Right of Use Agreement (IRU);

(b) To acquire less than the majority interest of the stock of a company offering, or capable of offering Broadband Services, unless otherwise approved by the Agency;

(c) To acquire the stock of an affiliate;

(d) To purchase or acquire any facilities or equipment of an affiliate of the applicant. However, the Agency may consider, on a case by case basis, such funding if the Applicant can demonstrate that the purchase or acquisition will be an arms-length transaction, and that the cost is the most economically available for the facilities or equipment in question;

(e) To finance Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) not owned by the Applicant during its economic life and any associated inside wiring, unless:

(1) Additional collateral, acceptable to the Agency, at least equal to the purchase price of the CPE is pledged, which collateral has not been purchased with loan funds, or

(2) A revolving fund for the initial purchase of CPE to be sold is established, and as CPE is sold to the customer, at least the Borrower's cost of such equipment is deposited back from the proceeds of the sale into the revolving fund to purchase additional CPE units. For additional information on this option, refer to Bulletin 1738–1.

(f) To purchase or lease vehicles not used primarily in construction of the Broadband Service project to be financed; or

(g) To finance systems or facilities that have not been designed and constructed in accordance with the loan contract, which incorporates Bulletin1738–2.

§§ 1738.24–1738.29 [Reserved]

Subpart D—Loan Application Requirements

§ 1738.30 General.

A loan application will be considered complete upon the submission of acceptable information regarding:

(a) The equity requirement;

(b) The legal notice;

(c) The market survey;

(d) The competitive analysis;

(e) The business plan;

(f) The financial information; and

(g) The system design.

§ 1738.31 Equity requirement.

(a) To be eligible for a loan, an applicant must have a minimum equity position in the operation proposed to be funded. For start-up companies, new entrants into an area and Incumbent Service Providers that are proposing to extend their service territory, the applicant must demonstrate a minimum equity position equal to 10 percent of the requested loan amount at the time the application is submitted. For all other applications, the applicant must demonstrate a minimum equity position equal to 20 percent of the requested loan amount at the time the application is submitted. If the applicant does not have the required equity in the operation to be funded at the time the application is submitted, the shortfall for this requirement can be satisfied as follows:

(1) With an investor's proposal to cover the shortfall of the equity requirement by infusing additional capital into the operation. The additional capital must be deposited into the applicant's operating accounts prior to loan closing. If this option is elected, evidence must be included in the application that clearly identifies the investor's commitment to the project along with its bank or financial statements that demonstrates its ability to satisfy this requirement. This evidence must be acceptable to the Agency before the application will be considered complete and ready for further processing. If an investor's proposal to satisfy this requirement is not included in the loan application, the application will be returned. The Agency reserves the right to reject investments that are on a preferred basis for any reason.

(2) With an unconditional, irrevocable letter of credit (LOC) satisfactory to the Agency. If an LOC will be used to satisfy the equity requirement, the LOC must be secured and serviced by an entity other than the applicant applying for the loan and must remain in effect until the applicant's financial position has reached a Net Worth equal to 20 percent of Total Assets after 80 percent of loan funds have been expended. The Agency must be an unconditional payee under the LOC and the LOC must be in place prior to loan closing.

(b) For State and local governments, the equity requirement can be satisfied with general obligation bonds. If the equity requirement is satisfied with general obligation bonds, the Broadband Loan or loan guarantee cannot be subordinate to the bonds.

(c) Revenue bonds supported by the operations being funded cannot be used to satisfy the equity requirement.

(d) Based on the results of the Agency's financial analysis of the application, additional equity requirements may be included as covenants to a loan offer.

(e) The Administrator reserves the right to modify or waive the requirements of this section as long as those modifications do not result in a projected negative cash position in any quarter throughout the forecast period and the modifications are required to provide Broadband Service in areas that are not capable of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider.

§ 1738.32 Additional cash requirements.

(a) Once the Agency has completed its review of the loan application, the applicant will be notified if additional cash requirements are needed to support the feasibility of the loan. Additional cash infusions will be necessary when the Agency's financial analysis indicates that cash from operations and previous cash infusions cannot sustain a positive cash position throughout the forecast period.

(1) The amount of the additional cash infusions required must bring the cash balance at the end of each year of the Forecast Period to zero.

(2) For purposes of satisfying the additional cash requirement for a start-up operation or an operation that has not demonstrated positive cash flow for the two previous years prior to the date the application was submitted, only 50 percent of projected revenues for each year of the forecast period will be used in the feasibility study to determine if an operation can sustain a positive cash position.

(3) The applicant will be required to infuse additional cash into the operation to cover projected deficits for the first two years of operations at loan closing and to enter into legal arrangements with the Agency committing to additional cash infusions to ensure that the operation will sustain a positive cash position on a quarterly basis throughout the forecast period.

(4) If debt is incurred to satisfy the additional cash requirement, this debt must take a subordinate lien position to the Agency debt. The Agency will provide the applicant with options for satisfying any additional requirements.

(5) Once the applicant has agreed to a method for satisfying the additional cash requirements, this method will be incorporated into the loan documents.

(6) If a loan is offered to the applicant, the applicant will have 120 days from the date of the loan contract to have the additional cash infusions deposited into the company applying for the loan and enter into any other legal arrangements to cover proposed deficits. If these requirements are not completed within this timeframe, the loan offer will be terminated, absent a written request from the applicant, and consent thereto from the Agency.

(b) If additional requirements and covenants are required to obtain loan approval, they will be detailed in the loan documents.

§ 1738.33 Legal notice.

(a) All applicants, as part of submitting a completed application, must prepare a legal notice to be published on the Agency Web page stating the applicant's intent to offer Broadband Service in a particular community. In addition, if the applicant is proposing other (*i.e.* video, voice, etc.) services, these services must also be identified in the legal notice. The legal notice will be published on the Agency's Web page after the application has been received in the Agency's national office and will remain on the Web page for a period of 30 work days. The notice must set forth the applicant's total proposed service area, including a service area map, and request any Incumbent Service Provider to submit to the Agency, within this 30 day period, the following information:

(1) The number of residential and business customers capable of receiving Broadband Service in the applicant's proposed service area;

(2) The number of residential and business customers purchasing Broadband Service in the applicant's proposed service area, the rates of data transmission being offered, and the cost of each level of Broadband Service;

(3) The number of residential and business customers receiving other services that will be offered in the applicant's proposed service area and the associated rates for these other services;

(4) A map of its service territory.

(b) The information that is submitted by the Incumbent Service Provider will be used by the Agency to determine if the Incumbent Service Provider will be classified as an Existing Broadband Service Provider. If an Incumbent Service Provider does not submit a response to the legal notice, it will not be considered an Existing Broadband Service Provider. However, all Incumbent Service Providers will be considered in the Agency lending decision.

(c) All proprietary and confidential information submitted by the incumbent in response to the legal notice will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

§ 1738.34 Market survey.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, the applicant must complete a market survey for each area where Broadband Service is proposed to be provided and include it as part of the application. The survey must not only include questions about the deployment of Broadband Services but must also address all other services that are being proposed. The survey must be conducted on each Eligible Rural Community where service is proposed. Additional information on the requirements of the market survey can be found in Bulletin 1738–1.

(b) For any service that the applicant is projecting less than a 15 percent penetration of households passed in the total proposed service territory, by the end of the Forecast Period, a market survey does not need to be completed. The proposed rates for these services must be affordable as determined by the Agency. If the rates are not affordable, the Agency will require that a market survey be completed.

(c) Generally, for a market survey to be acceptable to the Agency, it must have been completed within six months from the date the application was submitted to the Agency for processing. The Agency reserves the right to reject any market survey so long as it can demonstrate that the market survey does not support the financial projections or the business plan or that the demographics of the proposed service territory have significantly changed since the survey was completed.

(d) With respect to loans for areas that do not have the capability of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider, the Administrator reserves the right to waive or modify the requirements of this section on a case by case basis.

§ 1738.35 Competitive analysis.

The applicant must identify all competitors, including resellers, in their proposed service territory irregardless of the competitor's market share and prepare a competitive analysis, for all types of services proposed and include it as part of the application. This analysis must include each competitor's proposed rate packages for all services offered and to the extent possible, the level of service being provided and the area that is being covered. Although a market survey is not required for areas where an applicant is projecting less than 15 percent penetration of the households passed for a specific service, a competitive analysis is required for all proposed service territories.

§ 1738.36 Business plan.

A business plan must be included as part of the application and must address, at a minimum, the following items:

(a) The proposed use of loan funds and if any non-loan funds will be required to complete the proposed project;

(b) A detailed description of working capital requirements and the source of these funds;

(c) A description of how the equity requirements will be satisfied;

(d) A description of the services that will be offered, the rates for the proposed services and the marketing plan to sell these services;

(e) A description of any current operations including services being provided, areas being served, rate structure and penetration rates;

(f) A description of any licenses and regulatory approvals that are required for the proposed operation including the status of obtaining these items;

(g) A detailed description of the qualifications of the proposed management team for the operation including a resume of each team member detailing prior positions held for the previous 10 years from the date the application is submitted;

(h) A description of the staffing requirements to operate the proposed system; and

(i) A description of the workforce that is required to construct the system. This description must agree with the build-out schedule included in § 1738.37.

§ 1738.37 Financial information.

The financial information that must be included in the application to support the business plan is as follows:

(a) Copies of audited financial statements (balance sheet, income statement, cash flow statement) for the three years preceding the date of the application for an existing company. If audited statements are not available, un-audited statements and tax returns for the three previous years must be submitted;

(b) Copies of audited financial statements for the parent operation for the year preceding the year the application was submitted if the applicant for the Broadband Loan is a subsidiary operation. If audited statements are not available, un-audited statements and tax returns for the previous year must be submitted;

(c) Copies of audited financial statements for any affiliated operation that is providing services to the applicant for the year preceding the year the application was submitted. If audited statements are not available, un-audited statements and tax returns for the previous year must be submitted;

(d) Customer projections for the forecast period that substantiate the projected revenues for each service that

is to be provided. The projections must at a minimum be on an annual basis and must be provided for each Eligible Rural Community that will be receiving service. These projections must be clearly supported by the information contained in the market survey;

(e) Financial projections in the form of balance sheets, income statements and cash flow statements for the 5-year forecast period. These projections must be supported by detailed narrative assumptions that fully explain the methodology used to develop the projections. The financial projections submitted by the applicant and the feasibility study prepared by the Agency must demonstrate that the proposed operation will be able to meet a minimum TIER requirement equal to 1.25 by the end of the forecast period. (A projected TIER of 1.25 does not guarantee that a loan will be approved.) Based on the findings of the feasibility study, the Agency will establish a TIER maintenance requirement in the loan documents that will remain in effect throughout the amortization period; and

(f) A list of all outstanding obligations of the applicant. Copies of existing notes and loan and security agreements must be included in the application.

§ 1738.38 System design.

(a) The system design must fully support the delivery of Broadband Service and any other services being provided, must demonstrate that the project will be completed within 3 years from the date of the loan contract, and must include the following items:

(1) A detailed description of the proposed technology that will be used to provide the services. This description must include sufficient information for the Agency to make the determination that all households in the proposed service territory will have the capability of receiving Broadband Services. For further clarification, reference Bulletin 1738–2;

(2) Existing and proposed network diagrams that clearly demonstrate the traffic flows through the network from the interconnection points with the backbone providers to the end users;

(3) Estimated project costs detailing all facilities that are required to complete the project. These estimated costs must be broken down to indicate costs associated with each community to be served; and

(4) A construction build-out schedule of the proposed facilities by community on a quarterly basis. The build-out schedule must:

(i) Include a description of the work force that will be required to complete the proposed construction;

(ii) Include a timeline demonstrating project completion within 3 years from the date of the Loan Contract;

(iii) Include detailed information showing that all households that are proposed to be passed with facilities funded by the Agency must have the capability of receiving Broadband Service with the completion of construction of the system. For additional information on how to satisfy this requirement, please refer to Bulletin 1738–1.

(iv) Include detailed information showing that construction of the proposed facilities will start within 6 months from the date the Administrator signs the Loan Documents.

(5) A depreciation schedule for the proposed facilities;

(6) Information required by 7 CFR part 1794, an environmental report prepared in accordance therewith;

(7) Any other system requirements which shall be published annually in the **Federal Register**, which the Administrator shall determine to be necessary in addressing the rapidly changing technological needs of the Broadband Program.

(b) With respect to loans for areas that are not capable of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider, the Administrator reserves the right to waive or modify the requirements of this section on a case by case basis.

§ 1738.39 Submission of the application.

Loan applications can be submitted directly to the Agency's National Office or can be submitted to the Agency's general field representative (GFR) that is assigned to the area where the applicant's headquarters are located. Although the applications can be submitted directly to the National Office, it is recommended that the applicant identify and contact the appropriate GFR as early as possible when preparing a loan application. The GFR will assist the applicant with the preparation of the application and explain the regulations and requirements that govern the Broadband Program. The applicant should contact the National Office in Washington to identify the GFR that is assigned to the area where their headquarters are located or refer to the list of GFR's assigned to different parts of the country on the Agency webpage. Please refer to the following Web address to identify the GFR assigned to your proposed service territory: *http://www.usda.gov/rus/telecom/staff/gfr-state-list.htm.* All applications must contain two hard copies and an electronic copy of the entire application.

Subpart E—Terms for Loans and Loan Guarantees

§ 1738.40 Direct 4 Percent and Cost of Money Loans.

(a) Terms and conditions of loans are set forth in a mortgage, note, and loan contract. Provisions of the mortgage and loan contract are implemented by provisions in the Agency bulletins and regulations. Samples of the mortgage, note, and loan contract can be found on the Agency Web page: *http://www.usda.gov/rus/telecom/broadband.htm.*

(b) The Agency reserves the right to establish terms and conditions, including security requirements, on a case-by-case basis.

§ 1738.41 Loan security.

(a) The Agency makes loans only if, in the judgment of the Administrator, the security is reasonably adequate and the loan will be repaid within the time agreed.

(b) The Agency generally requires that an applicant provide it with an exclusive first lien, in form and substance satisfactory to the Agency, on all of the applicant's property and such additional security as the Agency may require. The Agency will share its first lien position with another lender provided the Broadband Loan is adequately secured and the security arrangements are acceptable to the Agency. The Agency will consider entering into joint security arrangements with other lenders on a pari pasu, prorated basis.

(c) All collateral that is securing the loan must be free from liens or security interests other than those permitted by the Agency or the Security Documents. The applicant must own collateral that will be purchased with loan funds unless otherwise designated by the Agency.

(d) In the case of loans that include the financing of broadband facilities that do not constitute self-contained operating systems or units, the applicant shall, in addition to the mortgage and/or security lien on all of the applicant's facilities financed by the Agency, furnish adequate assurance, in the form of contractual or other arrangements, satisfactory to the Agency, that continuous and efficient broadband service will be rendered.

(e) Additional financial, investment, operational, reporting, and managerial controls will appear in the loan documents required by the Agency.

§ 1738.42 Payments on loans.

Broadband loans must be repaid with interest within a period that, rounded to the nearest whole year, equals the expected composite economic life of the facilities to be financed, as calculated by the Agency. The expected composite economic life shall be based upon the depreciation rates for the facilities financed by the loan.

(a) The depreciation rates used shall be the rates currently in place, as long as the Agency finds them to be reasonable for the telecommunications industry.

(b) Applicants may request a repayment period that is shorter than the expected composite economic life of the facilities financed. A shorter period may be approved as long as the Administrator determines that the loan remains feasible.

(c) Interest is payable on funds advanced each month as it accrues beginning with the first billing after the advance, as defined in the note. Principal payments on each note are scheduled to begin one year after the date of the first advance. After this deferral period, interest and principal payments on all funds advanced during this one-year period shall be made in equal monthly installments. Principal payments on funds advanced one year or more after the date of the first advance will begin with the first billing after the advance. The interest and principal payments on each of these advances shall be made in equal monthly installments. On a case by case basis for areas that are not capable of receiving Broadband Service or can receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Service Provider, the Administrator reserves the right to modify the terms and conditions for the interest and principal payments.

§ 1738.43 Loan guarantees.

(a) *Eligible guaranteed lenders.* To be eligible for a Loan Guarantee, guaranteed lenders must be legally organized lending institutions, such as commercial banks, trust companies, mortgage banking firms, insurance companies, and any other institutional investor authorized by law to loan money, which must be subject to credit examination and supervision by a Federal or state agency, unless the Agency determines that alternative examination and supervisory mechanisms are adequate.

(b) *Requirements for the Loan Guarantee.* At the time of application, Applicants must provide, in form and substance acceptable to the Agency:

(1) Evidence of the guaranteed lender's eligibility under paragraph (a) of this section;

(2) Evidence that the guaranteed lender is capable of adequately servicing the guaranteed loan;

(3) Evidence that the guaranteed lender is in good standing with its licensing authority and meets the loan making, loan servicing, and other requirements of the jurisdiction in which the lender makes loans;

(4) Evidence satisfactory to the Agency of its qualification under this part, along with the name of the authority that supervises it;

(5) A commitment letter from the guaranteed lender that will be providing the funding, and the terms of such funding, all of which may be conditioned on final approval of the Broadband Loan by the Agency; and

(6) A description of any and all charges and fees for the loan provided they are not greater than those normally charged other applicants for the same type of loan in the ordinary course of business. Notwithstanding, such charges and fees shall not be included within the loan guarantee.

(c) *Terms for Guarantee.* Loan Guarantees will only be given on the conditions that:

(1) The Loan Guarantee is no more than 80 percent of the principal amount, which shall exclude any and all charges and fees;

(2) The guarantee is limited to the loan repayment obligation of the Borrower and does not extend to guaranteeing that the guaranteed lender will remit to a holder, loan payments made by the Borrower;

(3) The interest rate must be fixed and must be the same or lesser for the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, and Unguaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Unguaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Unguaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be;

(4) The entire loan will be secured by the same security with equal lien priority for the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, and Unguaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Unguaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Unguaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be;

(5) The Unguaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Unguaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Unguaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, will neither be paid first nor given any preference or priority over the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be;

(6) Any assignment by the guaranteed lender requires the prior written approval from the Agency, which assignment shall entitle the holder to all of the guaranteed lender's rights, but which shall ultimately maintain the guaranteed lender responsible for servicing the entire loan;

(7) The Borrower, its principal officers, members of the borrower's board of directors and members of the immediate families of said officials shall not be a holder of the guaranteed lender's loan;

(8) The Agency will not guarantee any loan under this subpart that provides for a balloon payment of principal or interest at the final maturity date of the loan; or the payment of interest on interest;

(9) All loan guarantee documents between the Agency and the guaranteed lender are prepared by the Agency; and

(10) The guaranteed loan agreement between the borrower and the lender shall be subject to RUS approval.

(d) *Obligations of Guaranteed lender.* Once a loan guarantee has been approved, the Guaranteed lender will be responsible for:

(1) Fully servicing the loan;

(2) Determining that all prerequisites to each advance of loan funds by the lender under the terms of the contract of guarantee, all financing documents, and all related security documents have been fulfilled;

(3) Obtaining approval from the Agency to advance funds prior to each advance;

(4) Billing and collecting loan payments from the Borrower;

(5) Notifying the Administrator promptly of any default in the payment of principal and interest on the loan and submit a report, as soon thereafter as possible, setting forth its views as to the reasons for the default, how long it expects the borrower will be in default, and what corrective actions the borrower states it is taking to achieve a current debt service position; and

(6) Notifying the Administrator of any known violations or defaults by the borrower under the lending agreement, contract of guarantee, or related security instruments, or conditions of which the lender is aware which might lead to nonpayment, violation, or other default.

(e) *Certain Agency Rights and Remedies.* The Guarantee must provide that:

(1) Upon notice to the lender, RUS may assume loan servicing responsibilities for the loan or the Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, or require the lender to assign such responsibilities to a different entity, if the lender fails to perform its loan servicing responsibilities under the loan guarantee agreement, or if the lender becomes insolvent, makes an admission in writing of its inability to pay its debts generally as they become due, or becomes the subject of proceedings commenced under the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 (11 U.S.C. 101 *et seq.*) or any similar applicable Federal or state law, or is no longer in good standing with its licensing authority, or ceases to meet the eligibility requirements of this section. Such negligent servicing is defined as the failure to perform those services which a reasonable prudent lender would perform in servicing its own portfolio of loans that are not guaranteed, and includes not only a failure to act but also not acting in a timely manner.

(2) The Guarantee shall cease to be effective with respect to any Guaranteed Loan Amount or any Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or any Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent to the extent that:

(i) The Guaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Guaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Guaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, is separated at any time from the Unguaranteed Loan Amount or the respective Unguaranteed Loan Portion Amount or the respective Unguaranteed-Amount Equivalent, as the case may be, in any way, directly or through the issuance of any Guaranteed-Amount Equity Derivative or any Guaranteed-Amount Debt Derivative; or

(ii) Any holder of the Guaranteed Loan Note or any Guaranteed Loan Portion Note or any Derivative, as the case may be, having a claim to payments on the Guaranteed Loan receives more than its pro-rata percentage of any payment due to such holder from payments made under the Guarantee at any time during the term of the Guaranteed Loan.

(f) The Agency shall provide additional loan guarantee policies, consistent with OMB Circular A–129, in order to achieve its mission of promoting broadband in rural areas, which shall be published annually in the **Federal Register**.

(g) Loan guarantees made under this part are supported by the full faith and credit of the United States and incontestable except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder had actual knowledge at the time it became a holder.

§§ 1738.44–1738.49 [Reserved]

Subpart F—Post-Application Procedures

§ 1738.50 Notification of completeness.

The Agency will conduct an initial review of the application after it is received in the National Office to determine if the application is complete and ready for further analysis.

(a) If the application is determined to be complete, the applicant will be notified by the Agency and further analysis of the application will continue.

(b) If the application is determined to be incomplete, the applicant will receive a detailed list of items requiring further explanation that will have to be fully addressed by the applicant and submitted to the Agency within a specified timeframe. If the applicant fails to submit the additional information in the specified timeframe, the application will be deemed ineligible for funding and returned to the applicant.

(c) If the application is determined to be ineligible for funding, the application will be returned and the applicant will receive a detailed list explaining the reasons the application was not accepted.

§ 1738.51 Determination of feasibility.

(a) Loans will only be made under this part if the applicant's financial operations, taking into account the impact of the facilities financed with the proceeds of the loan and the associated debt, are financially feasible, as determined by the Agency.

(b) If the application is determined to meet all statutory and regulatory requirements and the feasibility study demonstrates that the TIER requirement can be satisfied, the application will be submitted to the Agency's credit committees for consideration. Submission of the application to the Agency's credit committees does not guarantee that a loan will be approved.

§ 1738.52 Notice to applicant on decision.

Once the Agency's credit committees have considered the application, the applicant will be notified of the Agency's decision concerning their request for financial assistance.

§§ 1738.53–1738.59 [Reserved]

Subpart G—Miscellaneous Requirements and Information

§ 1738.60 Interim financing and construction.

(a) Upon notification by the Agency that an applicant has submitted all the required documentation and the application is considered complete for the Agency to conduct its analysis, the applicant, at it's own risk, may enter into an interim financing agreement with a lender other than the Agency or use its own internally generated funds to start construction that is included in the loan application. The Agency's determination that an application is considered complete for analysis is not a commitment that a loan will be approved.

(b) To qualify for funding, interim construction must comply with the same requirements that apply to construction included in an approved broadband loan. For information on requirements, see 7 CFR part 1788, 7 CFR part 1794, Bulletin 1738–2, Bulletin 20–15, and Bulletin 320–15.

§ 1738.61 Priority for processing loan applications.

(a) In making or guaranteeing loans, priority shall be given to applications in the following order:

(1) Applications for service areas that include only households that have no broadband access or receive Broadband Service from only one Existing Broadband Service Provider.

(2) Applications for service areas that include only areas where at least 40 percent of households have no access to Broadband service or access to only one Existing Broadband Service provider;

(3) All other applications

(b) Once an application has been prioritized according to the criteria listed in paragraphs (a) (1) through (3) of this section, they will be processed on a first-in, first-out basis within each priority category.

(c) As applications are processed, using the first-in, first-out process, RUS may expedite for consideration for funding applications proposing to provide service where none is available.

§ 1738.62 Allocation of funds.

For funds made available for each fiscal year, national and State reserves shall be established in accordance with Title VI of the RE ACT.

§ 1738.63 Annual audit and reporting requirements.

(a) If a loan offer is accepted, the applicant will be required to submit an annual CPA audit. The first audit is

required for the calendar year in which the loan is approved. The Administrator can waive the requirement that an audit be performed in the year in which the loan is approved if operations of the applicant have not yet started.

(b) If a loan offer is accepted, the applicant will be required to submit quarterly financial and progress reports utilizing the Agency's electronic reporting system.

§ 1738.64 Applicable laws.

(a) Applicants are required to comply with certain regulations on nondiscrimination and equal employment opportunity. See RUS Bulletin 1790–1, ''Nondiscrimination Among Beneficiaries of RUS Programs'' and RUS Bulletin 20–15:320–15, ''Equal Employment Opportunity in Construction Financed with RUS Loans''; 7 CFR parts 15 and 15b and 45 CFR part 90.

(b) Applicants are required to comply with all Federal, state and local laws, rules, regulations, ordinances, codes and orders.

§§ 1738.65–1738.99 [Reserved]

§ 1738.100 OMB control number.

The information collection requirements in this part are approved by the Office of Management Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB control number 0572–0130.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

James M. Andrew,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9021 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA–R04–OAR–2006–0362–200702; FRL–8312–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designations of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Kentucky: Redesignation of the Boyd County, Kentucky Portion of the Huntington-Ashland 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment for Ozone

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On September 29, 2006, the Commonwealth of Kentucky (Kentucky), through the Kentucky Division for Air Quality (KDAQ), submitted a request to redesignate the Kentucky portion of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area to attainment for the 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); and to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision containing a maintenance plan for the Kentucky portion of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland area. The bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area is comprised of one county in Kentucky (Boyd County) and two counties in West Virginia (Cabell and Wayne counties). In this action, EPA is proposing to approve Kentucky's 8-hour ozone redesignation request for Boyd County, which is the Kentucky portion of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area. Additionally, EPA is proposing to approve the 8-hour ozone maintenance plan for Boyd County, Kentucky, including the state motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) for nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). This proposed approval of Kentucky's redesignation request is based on EPA's determination that Kentucky has demonstrated that Boyd County, Kentucky has met the criteria for redesignation to attainment specified in the Clean Air Act (CAA), including the determination that the entire (both the Kentucky and West Virginia portions) Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard. On May 17, 2006, the State of West Virginia submitted a redesignation request and maintenance plan for the West Virginia portion (Cabell and Wayne counties) of this 8-hour ozone area. EPA has taken action on West Virginia's redesignation request and maintenance plan through a separate action. The final rulemaking approving the West Virginia submittal was published in the **Federal Register** on September 15, 2006. In this action, EPA is also providing the status of its transportation conformity adequacy determination for the new MVEBs for 2018 that are contained in the 8-hour ozone maintenance plan for Boyd County, Kentucky. MVEBs for Cabell and Wayne counties in West Virginia are included in the West Virginia submittal.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2006–0362, by one of the following methods:

(a) *www.regulations.gov:* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

(b) *E-mail: LeSane.Heidi@epa.gov.*

(c) *Fax:* 404–562–9019.

(d) *Mail:* EPA–R04–OAR–2006–0362 Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.

(e) *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Heidi LeSane, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2006–0362. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *www.regulations.gov*, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit through *www.regulations.gov* or e-mail, information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The *www.regulations.gov* Web site is an ''anonymous access'' system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through *www.regulations.gov*, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD–ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional information about EPA's public docket visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at *http://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm.*

Docket: All documents in the electronic docket are listed in the *www.regulations.gov* index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other

information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in *www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at the Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heidi LeSane, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–9074. Mrs. LeSane can also be reached via electronic mail at *LeSane.Heidi@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. What Proposed Actions Is EPA Taking?
II. What Is the Background for EPA's Proposed Actions?
III. What Are the Criteria for Redesignation?
IV. Why Is EPA Proposing These Actions?
V. What Is the Effect of EPA's Proposed Actions?
VI. What Is EPA's Analysis of the Request?
VII. What Are the Proposed State MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky?
VIII. What Is the Status of EPA's Adequacy Determination for the MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky?
IX. Proposed Action on the Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan SIP Revision Including Proposed Approval of the 2018 MVEBs
X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. What Proposed Actions Is EPA Taking?

EPA is proposing to take three related actions, which are summarized below and described in greater detail throughout the notice of proposed rulemaking: (1) To redesignate Boyd County, Kentucky to attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS; (2) to approve Kentucky's 8-hour ozone maintenance plan, including the associated MVEBs; and (3) to notify the public of the status of EPA's adequacy determination for the Boyd County MVEBs.

First, EPA is proposing to determine that the bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard, and that the Boyd County, Kentucky portion has met the requirements for redesignation under section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. The bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area is comprised of one county in Kentucky (Boyd County) and two counties in West Virginia (Cabell and Wayne counties). Today's proposal addresses only the Kentucky portion of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area. In a separate rulemaking, EPA approved the redesignation request and maintenance plan for the West Virginia portion of this 8-hour ozone area (see 71 FR 39618). EPA is now proposing to approve a request to change the legal designation of Boyd County, Kentucky from nonattainment to attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Second, EPA is also proposing to approve Kentucky's 8-hour ozone maintenance plan for Boyd County, Kentucky (such approval being one of the CAA criteria for redesignation to attainment status). The maintenance plan is designed to help keep the Huntington-Ashland area (of which Boyd County is a part) in attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS through 2018. Consistent with the CAA, the maintenance plan that EPA is proposing to approve today also includes 2018 state MVEBs for NO_X and VOCs. Therefore, EPA is proposing to approve the 2018 state MVEBs that are included as part of Kentucky's maintenance plan. These MVEBs apply only to Boyd County, Kentucky. MVEBs for Cabell and Wayne counties in West Virginia are included in the West Virginia submittal.

Third, EPA is announcing the status of EPA's Adequacy Process for the newly-established 2018 MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky. Through a separate action, MVEBs for West Virginia portion of this 8-hour ozone area were established (see 71 FR 39618). The Adequacy comment period for the Boyd County, Kentucky 2018 MVEBs began on June 21, 2006, with EPA's posting of the availability of this submittal on EPA's Adequacy Web site (*http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/currsips.htm*). The Adequacy comment period for these 2018 MVEBs closed on July 21, 2006. No requests for or adverse comments on this submittal were received during EPA's Adequacy comment period. Please see section VIII of this rulemaking for further explanation of this process, and for more details on the MVEBs.

Today's notice of proposed rulemaking is in response to Kentucky's September 29, 2006, SIP submittal which supersedes Kentucky's June 7, 2006, submittal that included a request for parallel processing. The September 29, 2006, submittal requested redesignation of Boyd County, Kentucky as part of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland Area, and included a SIP revision addressing the specific issues summarized above, and the necessary elements for redesignation described in section 107(d)(3)(E).

II. What Is the Background for EPA's Proposed Actions?

Ground-level ozone is not emitted directly by sources. Rather, emissions of NO_X and VOCs react in the presence of sunlight to form ground-level ozone. NO_X and VOCs are referred to as precursors of ozone. The CAA establishes a process for air quality management through the NAAQS.

On July 18, 1997, EPA promulgated a revised 8-hour ozone standard of 0.08 parts per million (ppm). This new standard is more stringent than the previous 1-hour ozone standard. Under EPA regulations at 40 CFR part 50, the 8-hour ozone standard is attained when the 3-year average of the annual fourth highest daily maximum 8-hour average ambient air quality ozone concentrations is less than or equal to 0.08 ppm (i.e., 0.084 ppm when rounding is considered). (See, 69 FR 23857 (April 30, 2004) for further information.) Ambient air quality monitoring data for the 3-year period must meet a data completeness requirement. The ambient air quality monitoring data completeness requirement is met when the average percent of days with valid ambient monitoring data is greater than 90 percent, and no single year has less than 75 percent data completeness as determined in Appendix I of part 50. Specifically, section 2.3 of 40 CFR part 50, Appendix I, ''Comparisons with the Primary and Secondary Ozone Standards'' states:

> The primary and secondary ozone ambient air quality standards are met at an ambient air quality monitoring site when the 3-year average of the annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentration is less than or equal to 0.08 ppm. The number of significant figures in the level of the standard dictates the rounding convention for comparing the computed 3-year average annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentration with the level of the standard. The third decimal place of the computed value is rounded, with values equal to or greater than 5 rounding up. Thus, a computed 3-year average ozone

concentration of 0.085 ppm is the smallest value that is greater than 0.08 ppm.

The CAA required EPA to designate as nonattainment any area that was violating the 8-hour ozone NAAQS based on the three most recent years of ambient air quality data. The Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area was designated using 2001–2003 ambient air quality data. The **Federal Register** document making these designations was signed on April 15, 2004, and published on April 30, 2004 (69 FR 23857). The CAA contains two sets of provisions—subpart 1 and subpart 2—that address planning and control requirements for ozone nonattainment areas. (Both are found in title I, part D.) Subpart 1 (which EPA refers to as ''basic'' nonattainment) contains general, less prescriptive, requirements for nonattainment areas for any pollutant—including ozone—governed by a NAAQS. Subpart 2 (which EPA refers to as ''classified'' nonattainment) provides more specific requirements for certain ozone nonattainment areas. Some 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas are subject only to the provisions of subpart 1. Other 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas are also subject to the provisions of subpart 2. Under EPA's Phase 1 8-hour ozone implementation rule (69 FR 23857) (Phase 1 Rule), signed on April 15, 2004 and published on April 30, 2004, an area was classified under subpart 2 based on its 8-hour ozone design value (i.e., the 3-year average of the annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentrations), if it had a 1-hour design value at or above 0.121 ppm (the lowest 1-hour design value in Table 1 of subpart 2). All other areas are covered under subpart 1, based upon their 8-hour ambient air quality design values.

Various aspects of EPA's Phase 1 8-hour ozone implementation rule were challenged in court and on December 22, 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit Court) vacated EPA's Phase 1 Implementation Rule for the 8-hour Ozone Standard. *South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. (SCAQMD)* v. *EPA*, 472 F.3d 882 (D.C. Cir. 2006). The D.C. Circuit Court held that certain provisions of EPA's Phase I Rule were inconsistent with the requirements of the CAA. The Court rejected EPA's reasons for implementing the 8-hour standard in nonattainment areas under subpart 1 in lieu of subpart 2 of title I, part D of the CAA. The Court also held that EPA improperly failed to retain four measures required for 1-hour nonattainment areas under the anti-backsliding provisions of EPA's regulations: (1) Nonattainment area New Source Review (NSR) requirements based on an area's 1-hour nonattainment classification; (2) CAA section 185 penalty fees for 1-hour severe or extreme nonattainment areas; (3) measures to be implemented pursuant to section 172(c)(9) or 182(c)(9) of the CAA, on the contingency of an area not making reasonable further progress toward attainment of the 1-hour NAAQS, or for failure to attain that NAAQS; and (4) certain conformity requirements for certain types of federal actions. The D.C. Circuit Court upheld EPA's authority to revoke the 1-hour standard provided that there were adequate anti-backsliding provisions in place.

This section sets forth EPA's views on the potential effect of the Court's ruling on this redesignation action. For the reasons described throughout this notice of proposed rulemaking, EPA does not believe that the D.C. Circuit Court's ruling alters any requirements relevant to the redesignation of the Kentucky portion of the Huntington-Ashland Area (Boyd County) so as to preclude redesignation, and does not prevent EPA from proposing to finalize, or finalizing, the Boyd County, Kentucky redesignation. EPA believes that the Court's decision, as it currently stands or as it may be modified based upon the petitions for rehearing that have been filed, imposes no impediment to moving forward with redesignation of the Huntington-Ashland Area to attainment, because redesignation is appropriate under the relevant redesignation provisions of the CAA and longstanding policies regarding redesignation requests.

The Huntington-Ashland Area was originally designated as moderate nonattainment for the 1-hour ozone standard on November 6, 1991 (56 FR 56694). The Area was redesignated as attainment for the 1-hour ozone standard on June 29, 1995 (60 FR 33748). On April 30, 2004, EPA designated the Huntington-Ashland Area (of which Boyd County is a part) as a ''basic'' 8-hour ozone nonattainment area. (69 FR 23857)

The D.C. Circuit Court's decision in 2006 also addressed the 8-hour ozone classification scheme. The Court rejected EPA's reasons for classifying areas under subpart 1 for the 8-hour standard, and remanded that matter to the Agency. Consequently, it is possible that the Huntington-Ashland Area could, as a result of the remand to EPA, be reclassified under subpart 2. Although any future decision by EPA to classify this area under subpart 2 might trigger additional future requirements for the area, this does not mean that redesignation cannot go forward now. EPA's position is based upon: (1) EPA's longstanding policy of evaluating requirements in accordance with the requirements due at the time that the request is submitted; and (2) consideration of the inequity of retroactively applying any requirements that might be applied in the future.

In September 2006, when Kentucky submitted its final redesignation request, the Huntington-Ashland Area was classified under subpart 1of the CAA, and was obligated to meet only the subpart 1 requirements. Under EPA's longstanding interpretation of section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA, to qualify for redesignation, states requesting redesignation to attainment must meet only the relevant SIP requirements that came due prior to the submittal of a complete redesignation request. See, ''Procedures for Processing Requests to Redesignate Areas to Attainment,'' Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, September 4, 1992; see also, Michael Shapiro Memorandum, ''SIP Requirements for Areas Submitting Requests for Redesignation to Attainment of the Ozone and Carbon Monoxide NAAQS On or After November 15, 1992,'' Memorandum from Michael H. Shapiro, Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, September 17, 1993; and 60 FR 12459, 12465–66 (March 7, 1995) (redesignation of Detroit-Ann Arbor). See, *Sierra Club* v. *EPA*, 375 F.3d 537 (7th Cir. 2004), which upheld this interpretation. See also, 68 FR 25418, 25424, 25427 (May 12, 2003) (redesignation of St. Louis, Missouri).

Moreover, it would be inequitable to retroactively apply any new SIP requirements that were not applicable at the time the request was submitted. The D.C. Circuit Court recognized the general inequity in retroactive rulemakings in *Sierra Club* v. *Whitman*, 285 F. 3d 63 (D.C. Cir. 2002), in which the D.C. Circuit Court upheld a district court's refusal to make retroactive an EPA determination of nonattainment that was past the statutory due date. Such a determination would have resulted in the imposition of additional requirements on the area. In *Sierra Club*, the D.C. Circuit Court stated, ''[a]lthough EPA failed to make the nonattainment determination within the statutory time frame, Sierra Club's proposed solution only makes the situation worse. Retroactive relief would likely impose large costs on the states, which would face fines and suits for not

implementing air pollution prevention plans in 1997, even though they were not on notice at the time.'' *Id.* at 68. Similarly, with regard to Kentucky's redesignation request, it would be unfair to penalize Kentucky by retroactively applying to it for purposes of redesignation, additional SIP requirements under subpart 2 that were not in effect at the time it submitted its redesignation request, and that are not currently in effect, but that might be in effect as a result of the D.C. Circuit Court's remand.

With respect to the requirements under the 1-hour standard ozone standard, Boyd County, Kentucky was originally designated as moderate nonattainment for the 1-hour ozone standard in November 6, 1991 (56 FR 56694). The Area was redesignated as attainment for the 1-hour ozone standard on June 29, 1995 (60 FR 33748). Therefore, Boyd County, Kentucky was designated to attainment of the 1-hour ozone standard prior to its nonattainment designation for the 8-hour ozone standard. As a result, it is considered to be a 1-hour attainment area subject to a CAA section 175A maintenance plan for the 1-hour standard. The D.C. Circuit Court's ruling does not impact redesignation requests for these types of areas for two main reasons.

First, there are no conformity requirements relevant for the Huntington-Ashland redesignation request, such as a transportation conformity SIP.[1] It is EPA's longstanding policy position that it is reasonable to interpret the conformity SIP requirements as not applying for purposes of evaluating a redesignation request under section 107(d) because state conformity rules are still required after redesignation, and federal conformity rules apply where state rules have not been approved. See, 40 CFR 51.390; see also, *Wall* v. *EPA*, 265 F.3d 426 (6th Cir. 2001) (upholding EPA's interpretation). See also, 60 FR 62748 (Dec. 7, 1995) (redesignation of Tampa, Florida).

Second, with regard to the three other anti-backsliding provisions for the 1-hour standard that the D.C. Circuit Court found were not properly retained, Boyd County, Kentucky is an attainment area subject to a maintenance plan for the 1-hour standard, and the NSR, contingency measure (pursuant to section 172(c)(9) or 182(c)(9)), and fee provision requirements no longer apply to this area because it was redesignated to attainment of the 1-hour standard. As a result, the decision in *SCAQMD* should not alter any requirements that would preclude EPA from finalizing the Boyd County portion of the Huntington-Ashland area to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard.

As noted earlier, in 2005, the ambient ozone data for the Huntington-Ashland nonattainment area indicated no further violations of the 8-hour ozone standard, using data from the 3-year period of 2003–2005 (with a 2003–2005 design value of 0.079 ppm), to demonstrate attainment. As a result, on September 29, 2006, Kentucky requested redesignation of Boyd County, Kentucky to attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The redesignation request includes three years of complete, quality-assured ambient air quality data for the ozone seasons (March 1st until October 31st) of 2003–2005, indicating that the 8-hour ozone NAAQS has been achieved for the entire Huntington-Ashland area. Under the CAA, nonattainment areas may be redesignated to attainment if sufficient, complete, quality-assured data is available for the Administrator to determine that the area has attained the standard and the area meets the other CAA redesignation requirements in section 107(d)(3)(E).

III. What Are the Criteria for Redesignation?

The CAA provides the requirements for redesignating a nonattainment area to attainment. Specifically, section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA allows for redesignation providing that: (1) The Administrator determines that the area has attained the applicable NAAQS; (2) the Administrator has fully approved the applicable implementation plan for the area under section 110(k); (3) the Administrator determines that the improvement in air quality is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions resulting from implementation of the applicable SIP and applicable Federal air pollutant control regulations and other permanent and enforceable reductions; (4) the Administrator has fully approved a maintenance plan for the area as meeting the requirements of section 175A; and, (5) the state containing such area has met all requirements applicable to the area under section 110 and part D of the CAA.

EPA provided guidance on redesignation in the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the CAA Amendments of 1990, on April 16, 1992 (57 FR 13498), and supplemented this guidance on April 28, 1992 (57 FR 18070). EPA has provided further guidance on processing redesignation requests in the following documents:

1. ''Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Design Value Calculations,'' Memorandum from Bill Laxton, Director, Technical Support Division, June 18, 1990;
2. ''Maintenance Plans for Redesignation of Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Areas,'' Memorandum from G.T. Helms, Chief, Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Programs Branch, April 30, 1992;
3. ''Contingency Measures for Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Redesignations,'' Memorandum from G.T. Helms, Chief, Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Programs Branch, June 1, 1992;
4. ''Procedures for Processing Requests to Redesignate Areas to Attainment,'' Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, September 4, 1992 (hereafter referred to as the ''Calcagni Memorandum'');
5. ''State Implementation Plan (SIP) Actions Submitted in Response to Clean Air Act Deadlines,'' Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, October 28, 1992;
6. ''Technical Support Documents (TSDs) for Redesignation of Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Nonattainment Areas,'' Memorandum from G.T. Helms, Chief, Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Programs Branch, August 17, 1993;
7. '' State Implementation Plan (SIP) Requirements for Areas Submitting Requests for Redesignation to Attainment of the Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) On or After November 15, 1992,'' Memorandum from Michael H. Shapiro, Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, September 17, 1993;
8. ''Use of Actual Emissions in Maintenance Demonstrations for Ozone and CO Nonattainment Areas,'' Memorandum from D. Kent Berry, Acting Director, Air Quality Management Division, November 30, 1993;
9. ''Part D New Source Review (Part D NSR) Requirements for Areas Requesting Redesignation to Attainment,'' Memorandum from Mary D. Nichols, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, October 14, 1994; and
10. ''Reasonable Further Progress, Attainment Demonstration, and Related Requirements for Ozone Nonattainment Areas Meeting the Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard,'' Memorandum from John S. Seitz, Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, May 10, 1995.

IV. Why Is EPA Proposing These Actions?

On September 29, 2006, Kentucky requested redesignation of the Kentucky portion (Boyd County) of the bi-state Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. EPA's evaluation indicates that Kentucky has

[1] CAA section 176(c)(4)(E) requires states to submit revisions to their SIPs to reflect certain federal criteria and procedures for determining transportation conformity. Transportation conformity SIPs are different from the motor vehicle emissions budgets that are established in control strategy SIPs and maintenance plans.

demonstrated that Boyd County, Kentucky (as part of the Huntington-Ashland area) has attained the standard and has met the requirements for redesignation set forth in section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. EPA is also announcing the status of its adequacy determination for the 2018 state MVEBs, which is relevant to the requested redesignation.

V. What Is the Effect of EPA's Proposed Actions?

EPA's proposed actions establish the basis upon which EPA may take final action on these issues being proposed for approval today. Approval of Kentucky's redesignation request would change the official designation of Boyd County, Kentucky for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS found at 40 CFR part 81. Approval of Kentucky's request would also incorporate into the Kentucky SIP, a plan for maintaining the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in the Huntington-Ashland Area through 2018. The maintenance plan includes contingency measures to remedy future violations of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The maintenance plan also establishes state MVEBs of 1.18 tons per day (tpd) for VOC and 1.30 tpd for NO_X for the year 2018 for Boyd County, Kentucky. Approval of Kentucky's maintenance plan would also result in approval of the state MVEBs. Additionally, EPA is announcing the status of its adequacy determination for the 2018 state MVEBs pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1).

VI. What Is EPA's Analysis of the Request?

EPA is proposing to make the determination that the Boyd County portion of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard, and that all other redesignation criteria have been met for that portion of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area. EPA has made this determination with regard to West Virginia meeting the other redesignation criteria through a separate rulemaking (see 71 FR 39618). Therefore, the entire Huntington-Ashland area has air quality monitoring data showing attainment of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The basis for EPA's determination for the Boyd County area is discussed in greater detail below.

Criteria (1)—Boyd County Has Attained the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS

EPA is proposing to determine that the Boyd County portion of the Huntington-Ashland area has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. For ozone, an area may be considered to be attaining the 8-hour ozone NAAQS if there are no violations, as determined in accordance with 40 CFR 50.10 and Appendix I of part 50, based on three complete, consecutive calendar years of quality-assured air quality monitoring data. To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentrations measured at each monitor within an area over each year must not exceed 0.08 ppm. Based on the rounding convention described in 40 CFR part 50, Appendix I, the standard is attained if the design value is 0.084 ppm or below. The data must be collected and quality-assured in accordance with 40 CFR part 58, and recorded in the EPA Air Quality System (AQS). The monitors generally should have remained at the same location for the duration of the monitoring period required for demonstrating attainment.

EPA reviewed ozone monitoring data from ambient ozone monitoring stations in the Huntington-Ashland area for the ozone season from 2003–2005. This data has been quality assured and is recorded in AQS. The fourth high averages for 2003, 2004 and 2005, and the 3-year average of these values (i.e., design value), are summarized in the following table:

TABLE 1.—ANNUAL 4TH MAX HIGH AND DESIGN VALUE FOR 8-HOUR OZONE FOR HUNTINGTON-ASHLAND AREA

[Parts per million, ppm]

Year	Huntington (Cabell County)	Ashland (Boyd County)
2003	0.080	0.088
2004	0.066	0.068
2005	0.082	0.082
Design Value	0.076	0.079

As discussed above, the design value for an area is the highest design value recorded at any monitor in the area. Therefore, the design value for the Huntington-Ashland area is 0.079 ppm, which meets the standard as described above. Additionally, preliminary air quality data from the 2006 monitoring season indicates that the Huntington-Ashland Area is continuing to attain the 8-hour ozone standard. As discussed in more detail below, KDAQ has committed to continue monitoring in this area in accordance with 40 CFR part 58. The data submitted by Kentucky provides an adequate demonstration that Boyd County (as a part of the Huntington-Ashland area) has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Criteria (2)—Kentucky Has a Fully Approved SIP Under Section 110(k) for Boyd County and Criteria (5)—Kentucky Has Met All Applicable Requirements Under Section 110 and Part D of the CAA

Below is a summary of how these two criteria were met.

EPA has determined that Kentucky has met all applicable SIP requirements for the Boyd County under section 110 of the CAA (general SIP requirements). EPA has also determined that the Kentucky SIP satisfies the criterion that it meets applicable SIP requirements under part D of title I of the CAA (requirements specific to subpart 1 basic 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas) in accordance with section 107(d)(3)(E)(v). In addition, EPA has determined that the SIP is fully approved with respect to all applicable requirements in accordance with section 107(d)(3)(E)(ii). In making these determinations, EPA ascertained which requirements are applicable to the area and that if applicable, they are fully approved under section 110(k). SIPs must be fully approved only with respect to applicable requirements.

a. Boyd County, Kentucky Has Met All Applicable Requirements Under Section 110 and Part D of the CAA

The September 4, 1992, Calcagni Memorandum (see ''Procedures for Processing Requests to Redesignate Areas to Attainment,'' Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, September 4, 1992) describes EPA's interpretation of section 107(d)(3)(E). Consistent with this interpretation, to qualify for redesignation, states

requesting redesignation to attainment must meet only the relevant CAA requirements that come due prior to the submittal of a complete redesignation request. See also, Michael Shapiro Memorandum (''SIP Requirements for Areas Submitting Requests for Redesignation to Attainment of the Ozone and Carbon Monoxide NAAQS On or After November 15, 1992,'' September 17, 1993), and 60 FR 12459, 12465–66 (March 7, 1995) (redesignation of Detroit-Ann Arbor, Michigan). Applicable requirements of the CAA that come due subsequent to the area's submittal of a complete redesignation request remain applicable until a redesignation is approved, but are not required as a prerequisite to redesignation. See, section 175A(c) of the CAA; *Sierra Club*, 375 F.3d 537 (7th Cir. 2004); see also, 68 FR 25424, 25427 (May 12, 2003) (redesignation of St. Louis, Missouri).

General SIP requirements: Section 110(a)(2) of title I of the CAA delineates the general requirements for a SIP, which include enforceable emissions limitations and other control measures, means, or techniques, provisions for the establishment and operation of appropriate devices necessary to collect data on ambient air quality, and programs to enforce the limitations. General SIP elements and requirements are delineated in section 110(a)(2) of title I, part A of the CAA. These requirements include, but are not limited to, the following: submittal of a SIP that has been adopted by the state after reasonable public notice and hearing; provisions for establishment and operation of appropriate procedures needed to monitor ambient air quality; implementation of a source permit program; provisions for the implementation of part C requirements (Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)) and provisions for the implementation of part D requirements (New Source Review (NSR) permit programs); provisions for air pollution modeling; and provisions for public and local agency participation in planning and emission control rule development.

Section 110(a)(2)(D) requires that SIPs contain certain measures to prevent sources in a state from significantly contributing to air quality problems in another state. To implement this provision, EPA has required certain states to establish programs to address the transport of air pollutants (NO_X SIP Call, Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR)). EPA has also found, generally, that states have not submitted SIPs under section 110(a)(1) to meet the interstate transport requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i). However, the section 110(a)(2)(D) requirements for a state are not linked with a particular nonattainment area's designation and classification in that state. EPA believes that the requirements linked with a particular nonattainment area's designation and classifications are the relevant measures to evaluate in reviewing a redesignation request. The transport SIP submittal requirements, where applicable, continue to apply to a state regardless of the designation of any one particular area in the state. Thus, we do not believe that the CAA's interstate transport requirements should be construed to be applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation.

In addition, EPA believes that the other section 110 elements not connected with nonattainment plan submissions and not linked with an area's attainment status are not applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation. The area will still be subject to these requirements after the area is redesignated. The section 110 and part D requirements, which are linked with a particular area's designation and classification, are the relevant measures to evaluate in reviewing a redesignation request. This approach is consistent with EPA's existing policy on applicability (i.e., for redesignations) of conformity and oxygenated fuels requirements, as well as with section 184 ozone transport requirements. See, Reading, Pennsylvania, proposed and final rulemakings (61 FR 53174–53176, October 10, 1996), (62 FR 24826, May 7, 1997); Cleveland-Akron-Loraine, Ohio, final rulemaking (61 FR 20458, May 7, 1996); and Tampa, Florida, final rulemaking at (60 FR 62748, December 7, 1995). See also, the discussion on this issue in the Cincinnati, Ohio redesignation (65 FR 37890, June 19, 2000), and in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania redesignation (66 FR 50399, October 19, 2001).

EPA believes that section 110 elements not linked to the area's nonattainment status are not applicable for purposes of redesignation. Any section 110 requirements that are linked to the part D requirements for 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas are not yet due, since, as explained below, no part D requirements for 8-hour standard became due prior to submission of the redesignation request. Therefore, as discussed above, for purposes of redesignation, they are both considered applicable requirements. Nonetheless, EPA notes that it has previously approved provisions into the Kentucky SIP addressing section 110 elements (See 47 FR 30059, July 12, 1982). EPA believes that the section 110 SIP approved for the 1-hour ozone NAAQS is also sufficient to meet the requirements under the 8-hour ozone NAAQS (as well as satisfying the issue raised by the D.C. Circuit Court in the *SCAQMD* case).

Part D requirements: EPA has also determined that the Kentucky SIP meets applicable SIP requirements under part D of the CAA since no requirements became due prior to the submission of the area's redesignation request. Sections 172–176 of the CAA, found in subpart 1 of part D, set forth the basic nonattainment requirements applicable to all nonattainment areas. Section 182 of the CAA, found in subpart 2 of part D, establishes additional specific requirements depending on the area's nonattainment classification. Subpart 2 is not applicable to the Boyd County, Kentucky area.

Part D, subpart 1 applicable SIP requirements: For purposes of evaluating this redesignation request, the applicable part D, subpart 1 SIP requirements for all nonattainment areas are contained in sections 172(c)(1)–(9). A thorough discussion of the requirements contained in section 172 can be found in the General Preamble for Implementation of Title I (57 FR 13498). No requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation under part D became due prior to the submission of the redesignation request, and therefore none are applicable to the area for purposes of redesignation. For example, the requirements for an attainment demonstration that meets the requirements of section 172(c)(1) are not yet applicable, nor are the requirements for Reasonably Achievable Control Technology (RACT) and Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM) (section 172(c)(1)), reasonable further progress (RFP) (section 172(c)(2)), and contingency measures (section 172(c)(9)).

In addition to the fact that no part D requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation became due prior to submission of the redesignation request and therefore are not applicable, EPA believes it is reasonable to interpret the conformity and NSR requirements as not requiring approval prior to redesignation.

Section 176 Conformity Requirements: Section 176(c) of the CAA requires states to establish criteria and procedures to ensure that Federally supported or funded projects conform to the air quality planning goals in the applicable SIP. The requirement to determine conformity applies to transportation plans, programs and projects developed, funded or approved

under title 23 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Federal Transit Act (''transportation conformity'') as well as to all other Federally supported or funded projects (''general conformity''). State conformity revisions must be consistent with Federal conformity regulations relating to consultation, enforcement and enforceability that the CAA required the EPA to promulgate.

EPA believes it is reasonable to interpret the conformity SIP requirements as not applying for purposes of evaluating the redesignation request under section 107(d) because state conformity rules are still required after redesignation and Federal conformity rules apply where state rules have not been approved. See, *Wall*, 265 F.3d 426 (6th Cir. 2001), upholding this interpretation. See also, 60 FR 62748 (Dec. 7, 1995, Tampa, Florida).

EPA has also determined that areas being redesignated need not comply with the requirement that a NSR program be approved prior to redesignation, provided that the area demonstrates maintenance of the standard without a part D NSR program in effect since PSD requirements will apply after redesignation. The rationale for this view is described in a memorandum from Mary Nichols, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, dated October 14, 1994, entitled ''Part D New Source Review (Part D NSR) Requirements for Areas Requesting Redesignation to Attainment.'' Kentucky has demonstrated that the area will be able to maintain the standard without a part D NSR program in effect, and therefore, Kentucky need not have a fully approved part D NSR program prior to approval of the redesignation request. EPA most recently approved Kentucky's NSR program (including a nonattainment NSR and PSD program) in the Kentucky SIP on July 11, 2006 (71 FR 38990). Kentucky's PSD program will become effective in Boyd County, Kentucky upon redesignation to attainment. See, rulemakings for Detroit, Michigan (60 FR 12467–12468, March 7, 1995); Cleveland-Akron-Lorraine, Ohio (61 FR 20458, 20469–70, May 7, 1996); Louisville, Kentucky (66 FR 53665, October 23, 2001); Grand Rapids, Michigan (61 FR 31834–31837, June 21, 1996). Thus, Boyd County, Kentucky has satisfied all applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation under section 110 and part D of the CAA.

b. The Area Has a Fully Approved Applicable SIP Under Section 110(k) of the CAA

EPA has fully approved the applicable Kentucky SIP for Boyd County under section 110(k) of the CAA for all requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation. EPA may rely on prior SIP approvals in approving a redesignation request, see Calcagni Memorandum at p. 3; *Southwestern Pennsylvania Growth Alliance* v. *Browner*, 144 F.3d 984, 989–90 (6th Cir. 1998); *Wall*, 265 F.3d 426 (6th Cir. 2001), plus any additional measures it may approve in conjunction with a redesignation action. See, 68 FR 25426 (May 12, 2003) and citations therein. Following passage of the CAA of 1970 by the U.S. Congress, Kentucky adopted and submitted, and EPA has fully approved at various times, provisions addressing the various 1-hour ozone standard SIP elements applicable in the Boyd County, Kentucky (60 FR 33748, June 29, 1995).

As indicated above, EPA believes that the section 110 elements not connected with nonattainment plan submissions and not linked to the area's nonattainment status are not applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation. EPA also believes that since the part D requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation did not become due prior to submission of the redesignation request, they also are therefore not applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation.

Criteria (3)—The Air Quality Improvement in the Boyd County Portion of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour Ozone Area Is Due to Permanent and Enforceable Reductions in Emissions Resulting From Implementation of the SIP and Applicable Federal Air Pollution Control Regulations and Other Permanent and Enforceable Reductions

EPA believes that Kentucky has demonstrated that the observed air quality improvement in the area is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions resulting from implementation of the SIP, Federal measures, and other state-adopted measures. EPA has determined that the implementation of the following permanent and enforceable emissions controls, that occurred from 2001–2005, have reduced local NO_X and VOC emissions and brought the area into attainment:

2001–2005 EMISSION REDUCTION PROGRAMS

Highway Mobile Source Reductions:
Federal Motor Vehicle Control Programs (FMVCP)
Lower Reid Vapor Pressure
Fleet Turnover of Automobiles
Tier 2 Vehicle Emissions and Fuel Standards
Heavy Duty Engine and Vehicle Fuel Standards
Point Source Emissions Reductions:
Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM)
Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT)
Non-Highway Mobile Source Reductions:
Small Spark-Ignition engines
Large Spark-Ignition engines
Locomotives
Land based diesel engines
Additional Reductions:
NO_X SIP Call Reductions

Notably, no credit specific emission reduction is being claimed in the SIP for the NO_X SIP Call reductions although this program has resulted in measurable emissions reductions.

Kentucky has demonstrated that the implementation of permanent and enforceable emissions controls have reduced local VOC and NO_X emissions. Most of the reductions are attributable to Federal programs such as EPA's Tier 2/Low Sulfur Gasoline program and other national clean fuel programs that began implementation in 2004. Additionally, Kentucky has indicated in its September 2006 submittal that the Huntington-Ashland area has benefited from emissions reductions that have been achieved and will continue to be achieved through the implementation of the NO_X SIP Call, beginning in 2002. Kentucky has further demonstrated that year-to-year meteorological changes and trends are not the likely source of the overall, long-term improvements in ozone levels. In addition, the following non-highway mobile source reduction programs were implemented during the 2002–2004 period: Small spark-ignition engines, large-spark ignition engines, locomotives and land-base diesel engines. EPA believes that permanent and enforceable emissions reductions, in and surrounding the nonattainment area, are the cause of long-term improvements in ozone levels, and are the cause of the Huntington-Ashland Area achieving attainment of the ozone standard.

Criteria (4)—The Area Has a Fully Approved Maintenance Plan Pursuant to Section 175A of the CAA

In its request to redesignate the Boyd County, Kentucky area (as part of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone nonattainment area) to attainment, KDAQ submitted a SIP revision to provide for the maintenance of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in the Boyd County,

Kentucky area for at least 10 years after the effective date of redesignation to attainment.

a. What is required in a maintenance plan?

Section 175A of the CAA sets forth the elements of a maintenance plan for areas seeking redesignation from nonattainment to attainment. Under section 175A, the plan must demonstrate continued attainment of the applicable NAAQS for at least 10 years after the Administrator approves a redesignation to attainment. Eight years after the redesignation, Kentucky must submit a revised maintenance plan which demonstrates that attainment will continue to be maintained for the 10 years following the initial 10-year period. To address the possibility of future NAAQS violations, the maintenance plan must contain such contingency measures, with a schedule for implementation as EPA deems necessary to assure prompt correction of any future 8-hour ozone violations. Section 175A of the CAA sets forth the elements of a maintenance plan for areas seeking redesignation from nonattainment to attainment. The Calcagni Memorandum provides additional guidance on the content of a maintenance plan. The Calcagni Memorandum explains that an ozone maintenance plan should address five requirements: The attainment emissions inventory, maintenance demonstration, monitoring, verification of continued attainment, and a contingency plan. As is discussed more fully below, Kentucky's maintenance plan includes all the necessary components and is approvable as part of the redesignation request.

b. Attainment Emissions Inventory

In coordination with West Virginia, Kentucky selected 2004 as ''the attainment year'' for Boyd County (as part of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area) for the purposes of demonstrating attainment of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. This attainment inventory identifies the level of emissions in the area which is sufficient to attain the 8-hour ozone standard. Kentucky began development of this attainment inventory by first developing a baseline emissions inventory for the Boyd County. The year 2002 was chosen as the base year for developing a comprehensive ozone precursor emissions inventory for which projected emissions could be developed for 2004, 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014, 2017, and 2018. Non-road mobile emissions were calculated using the most recent non-road model. On-road mobile source emissions were calculated using EPA's MOBILE6.2 emission factors model. The 2004 VOC and NO_X emissions (as well as the emissions for other years) for Boyd County, Kentucky were developed consistent with EPA guidance, and are summarized in the table in the following subsection.

c. Maintenance Demonstration

The September 29, 2006, final submittal includes a maintenance plan for the Boyd County area. This demonstration:

(i) Shows compliance and maintenance of the 8-hour ozone standard by providing information to support the demonstration that current and future emissions of VOC and NO_X remain at or below attainment year 2004 emissions levels. The year 2004 was chosen as the attainment year because it is one of the most recent three years (i.e., 2003, 2004, and 2005) for which the Huntington-Ashland area has clean air quality data for the 8-hour ozone standard.

(ii) Uses 2004 as the attainment year and includes future emission inventory projections for the 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014, 2017 and 2018.

(iii) Identifies an ''out year,'' at least 10 years after the time necessary for EPA to review and approve the maintenance plan. Per 40 CFR part 93, a MVEB was established for the last year of the maintenance plan (2018). See section VII below.

(iv) Provides the following actual and projected emissions inventories for the Boyd County portion of the Huntington-Ashland nonattainment area.

TABLE 2.—BOYD COUNTY VOC EMISSIONS

[Tons per day]*

Source category	2004	2005	2008	2011	2014	2017	2018
Point	17.52	17.76	18.49	19.09	19.81	20.54	20.79
Area	2.97	2.97	2.97	2.97	2.97	2.97	2.97
Mobile**	2.50	2.28	1.91	1.63	1.38	1.23	1.18
Nonroad	0.71	0.68	0.61	0.56	0.55	0.56	0.56
Total	23.70	23.69	23.98	24.25	24.71	25.30	25.50

* See further information in Section VI(4)(e) Verification of Continued Attainment.
** Calculated using MOBILE 6.2.

TABLE 3.—BOYD COUNTY NO_X EMISSIONS

[Tons per day]*

Source category	2004	2005	2008	2011	2014	2017	2018
Point	16.17	16.35	16.90	17.37	17.92	18.48	18.68
Area	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Mobile**	3.79	3.60	2.98	2.36	1.79	1.41	1.30
Nonroad	1.83	1.81	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.48	1.47
Total	21.89	21.86	21.69	21.46	21.35	21.47	21.55

* See further information in Section VI(4)(e) Verification of Continued Attainment.
** Calculated using MOBILE 6.2.

Although the Kentucky SIP submission provided VOC and NO_X emissions for the attainment and future years for Boyd County, EPA considers emissions from the entire Huntington-Ashland area for a demonstration of maintenance. Maintenance is demonstrated if the future year NO_X and VOC emission for the entire area remains at or below the level of the attainment year emissions. Both Kentucky and West Virginia chose 2004

for their ''attainment year'' for this area. While the VOC emissions for the Boyd County, Kentucky portion of the Huntington-Ashland area indicate a steady increase of emissions beyond the attainment year, it is important to note that this area is comprised of three counties for which emissions should be considered. EPA's review of VOC emissions for the entire area indicates that these emissions are 47.40 tpd in 2004, and 45.20 tpd in 2018, which is an overall downward trend in emissions for the area. Similarly, EPA's review of NO_X emissions for the entire area also indicates an overall downward trend in emissions for the area, with a total of 59.29 tpd in 2004 and 48.55 tpd in 2018. Therefore, it is highly likely that maintenance of the 8-hour ozone standard will be maintained in the future for the Huntington-Ashland area.

d. Monitoring Network

There are currently two monitors measuring ozone in the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area (one in Cabell County, West Virginia and one in Boyd County, Kentucky). KDAQ has committed in the maintenance plan to continue operation of the monitor in Boyd County in compliance with 40 CFR part 58, and has addressed the requirement for monitoring. West Virginia has provided a similar commitment for the monitor in Cabell County, West Virginia.

e. Verification of Continued Attainment

Kentucky has the legal authority to enforce and implement the requirements of the ozone maintenance plan for the Boyd County, Kentucky area. This includes the authority to adopt, implement and enforce any subsequent emissions control contingency measures determined to be necessary to correct future ozone attainment problems.

Kentucky will track the progress of the maintenance plan by performing future reviews of actual emissions for the area using the latest emissions factors, models and methodologies. For these periodic inventories Kentucky will review the assumptions made for the purpose of the maintenance demonstration concerning projected growth of activity levels. If any of these assumptions appear to have changed substantially, Kentucky will re-project emissions. Following the redesignation of the area, sources are prohibited from reducing emission controls already in place when attainment is achieved unless EPA approves a SIP revision consistent with section 110 of the CAA.

Kentucky and EPA have instituted the following programs that will remain enforceable and are included as part of Kentucky's September 2006 SIP submittal, to maintain air quality which meets the NAAQS for the 8-hour ozone standard.

- All new major VOC or NO_X sources locating in Kentucky shall as a minimum apply control procedures that are reasonable, available, and practical;
- All major modifications to existing major VOC or NO_X sources are subject to RACM requirements as well as the BACT requirement of the Kentucky Division of Air Quality PSD regulations;
- Federal Motor Control Standards apply in Kentucky;
- Transportation Conformity Requirements;
- PSD Requirements;
- Federal Controls on certain nonroad engines (e.g. diesel and other Federal requirements, industrial diesel equipment, locomotives) after 2000;
- Federal controls on the VOC content for Architectural and Maintenance Paints, Auto Body Shops and Consumer Products.

In addition to these measures, Kentucky explains that more controls are expected to occur in the Boyd County area which are not factored into the projected future year emissions analyses. For example, a major refinery, Marathon Ashland Oil Cattlesburg is undergoing a project entitled the Refinery Modernization Project, which involves new operational and emissions limitations. The proposed Refinery Modernization Project involves installation of new equipment and upgrading of existing equipment. The following emission reductions were expected to occur from the Ashland Project by 2006:

- PM 33 tons per year (decrease)
- PM_{10} 33 tons per year (decrease)
- SO_2 3,605 tons per year (decrease)
- NO_X 730 tons per year (decrease)
- CO 4 tons per year (decrease)
- VOC 64 tons per year (decrease)

When these reductions are factored into future emission inventories, the totals for the emission inventories for Boyd County are expected to decrease.

f. Contingency Plan

The contingency plan provisions are designed to promptly correct any violation of the NAAQS that occurs after redesignation. Section 175A of the CAA requires that a maintenance plan include such contingency measures as EPA deems necessary to assure that the state will promptly correct a violation of the NAAQS that occurs after redesignation. The maintenance plan should identify the contingency measures to be adopted, a schedule and procedure for adoption and implementation, and a time limit for action by the state. A state should also identify specific indicators to be used to determine when the contingency measures need to be implemented. The maintenance plan must include a requirement that a state will implement all measures with respect to control of the pollutant that were contained in the SIP before redesignation of the area to attainment in accordance with section 175A(d). This requirement is met because all SIP measures are retained for maintenance. Kentucky's submittal satisfies all the contingency plan requirements described in section 175A of the CAA.

In the September 29, 2006, final submittal, Kentucky affirms that a combination of all programs instituted by Kentucky and EPA have resulted in cleaner air in the Huntington-Ashland area and the anticipated future benefits from these programs are expected to result in continued maintenance of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in this area. Sources are prohibited from terminating emissions controls following the redesignation of Boyd County unless EPA approves a SIP revision consistent with section 110 of the CAA. The contingency plan includes tracking and triggering mechanisms to determine when contingency measures are needed and a process of developing and adopting appropriate control measures. The primary trigger is a measured violation of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. If there is a measured violation of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in Boyd County, Kentucky commits to develop regulations for at least one of the following control measures for submission to the EPA within nine months. All regulatory programs will be implemented within 18 months from a measured violation. Kentucky will consider one or more of the measures contained in the list of potential contingency measures below.

The secondary triggers in the contingency plan are (1) if a measured value of the fourth highest maximum is 0.087 ppm or greater at the Boyd County monitor in a single ozone season, or (2) if periodic emission inventory updates reveal excessive or unanticipated growth greater than 10 percent in ozone precursor emissions. If either of these two triggers are met, Kentucky will evaluate existing control measures to determine if any further emission reduction measures should be implemented at that time.

Potential Contingency Measures:

- Implementation of a program to require additional emission reductions on stationary source;

• Implementation of a program to enhance inspection of stationary sources to ensure emission control equipment is functioning properly;
• Open burning restrictions during ozone season;
• High-volume, low pressure spray guns and low VOC degreaser solvents;
• Implementation of incentives for alternative fuels programs;
• Restriction of certain roads or lanes to, or construction of such roads or lanes for use by, passenger buses or high occupancy vehicles;
• Trip-reduction ordinances;
• Employer-based transportation management plans including incentives;
• Programs to limit or restrict vehicle use in downtown areas, or other areas of emission concentration particularly during periods of peak use;
• Programs for new construction and major reconstructions of paths or tracks for use by pedestrians or by non-motorized vehicles when economically feasible and in the public interest.

EPA has concluded that the maintenance plan adequately addresses the five basic components of a maintenance plan: Attainment inventory, maintenance demonstration, monitoring network, verification of continued attainment, and a contingency plan. The maintenance plan SIP revision submitted by Kentucky for Boyd County meets the requirements of section 175A of the CAA and is approvable.

VII. What Are the Proposed State MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky?

Under the CAA, states are required to submit, at various times, control strategy SIPs and maintenance plans in ozone areas. These control strategy SIPs (reasonable further progress SIPs and attainment demonstration SIPs etc.) and maintenance plans create MVEBs for criteria pollutants and/or their precursors to address pollution from cars and trucks. Per 40 CFR part 93, a MVEB is established for the last year of the maintenance plan. The MVEB is the portion of the total allowable emissions in the maintenance demonstration that is allocated to highway and transit vehicle use and emissions. See, 40 CFR 93.101. The MVEB serves as a ceiling on emissions from an area's planned transportation system. The MVEB concept is further explained in the preamble to the November 24, 1993, transportation conformity rule (58 FR 62188). The preamble also describes how to establish the MVEB in the SIP and revise the MVEB.

Kentucky and West Virginia have elected to develop separate state MVEBs to cover their individual portions of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area. As required, Kentucky is only establishing state MVEBs for NO_X and VOC for the last year of the maintenance plan (2018). EPA is now proposing to approve these state MVEBs. The state MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky are defined in the table below.

TABLE 4.—BOYD COUNTY 2018 MVEBS

[Tons per day]

NO_X	VOC
1.30	1.18

Through this rulemaking, EPA is proposing to approve the 2018 state MVEBs for NO_X and VOCs for Boyd County, Kentucky because EPA has determined that the Huntington-Ashland area maintains the 8-hour ozone standard with emissions at the levels of the budgets. As mentioned above, these MVEBs will be separate state area budgets for Boyd County, Kentucky. West Virginia established MVEBs for the remainder of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area (i.e., Cabell and Wayne counties) through the 8-hour ozone maintenance plan that was submitted with West Virginia's request for redesignation. Through a separate rulemaking, EPA found adequate and approved the MVEBs for the West Virginia portion of this 8-hour ozone area (see 71 FR 39618). Once the new state MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky (the subject of this rulemaking) are approved or found adequate (whichever is done first), they must be used for future transportation conformity determinations. As is discussed in greater detail below, EPA is also announcing the status of its adequacy determination for the proposed 2018 MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1).

VIII. What Is the Status of EPA's Adequacy Determination of the MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky?

Under section 176(c) of the CAA, new transportation projects, such as the construction of new highways, must ''conform'' to (i.e., be consistent with) the part of the State's air quality plan that addresses pollution from cars and trucks. ''Conformity'' to the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS. If a transportation plan does not ''conform,'' most new projects that would expand the capacity of roadways cannot go forward. Regulations at 40 CFR part 93 set forth EPA policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating and assuring conformity of such transportation activities to a SIP. The regional emissions analysis is one, but not the only, requirement for implementing transportation conformity. Transportation conformity is a requirement for nonattainment and maintenance areas. Maintenance areas are areas that were previously nonattainment for a particular NAAQS but have since been redesignated to attainment with a maintenance plan for that NAAQS.

When reviewing submitted ''control strategy'' SIPs or maintenance plans containing MVEBs, EPA must affirmatively find the MVEB contained therein ''adequate'' for use in determining transportation conformity. Once EPA affirmatively finds the submitted MVEB is adequate for transportation conformity purposes, that MVEB can be used by state and Federal agencies in determining whether proposed transportation projects ''conform'' to the SIP as required by section 176(c) of the CAA.

EPA's substantive criteria for determining ''adequacy'' of an MVEB are set out in 40 CFR 93.118(e). The process for determining ''adequacy'' consists of three basic steps: Public notification of a SIP submission, a public comment period, and EPA's adequacy finding. This process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP MVEBs was initially outlined in EPA's May 14, 1999 guidance, ''Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999, Conformity Court Decision.'' This guidance was finalized in the Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the ''New 8-Hour Ozone and PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; transportation conformity rule amendments—Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Change'' on July 1, 2004 (69 FR 40004). EPA follows this guidance and rulemaking in making its adequacy determinations.

Kentucky's maintenance plan submission contained new VOC and NO_X MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky for the year 2018. The availability of the Kentucky SIP submission with the Boyd County MVEBs was announced for public comment on EPA's adequacy Web page on June 21, 2006 at: *http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/currsips.htm.* The EPA public comment period on adequacy of the 2018 MVEBs for the Boyd County, Kentucky closed on July 21, 2006. EPA did not receive any adverse comments

regarding the MVEBs or requests for the submittal.

EPA's current intentions are to make its determination of the adequacy of the 2018 MVEBs for Boyd County, Kentucky for transportation conformity purposes in the final rulemaking on the redesignation of the Boyd County, Kentucky portion of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area. If EPA finds the 2018 MVEBs adequate and approves the 2018 MVEBs in the final rulemaking action, the new MVEBs must be used for future transportation conformity determinations. The new 2018 MVEBs, if found adequate and approved in the final rulemaking, will be effective the date of publication of EPA's final rulemaking in the **Federal Register**. For required regional emissions analysis years that involve the year 2017 or before, the applicable budget for the purposes of conducting transportation conformity will be the MVEBs for Boyd County from the Huntington-Ashland 1-hour ozone maintenance plan. For required regional emissions analysis years that involve 2018 or beyond, the applicable budgets are defined in section VII of this rulemaking.

IX. Proposed Actions on the Redesignation Request and the Maintenance Plan SIP Revision Including Proposed Approval of the 2018 MVEBs

Today, EPA is proposing to determine that Boyd County, Kentucky has met the criteria for redesignation from nonattainment to attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Further, EPA is proposing to approve Kentucky's redesignation for Boyd County, Kentucky (as a part of the Huntington-Ashland 8-hour ozone area). In a separate action, EPA approved the 8-hour ozone redesignation of the West Virginia portion of this area from nonattainment to attainment. See, 71 FR 54421 (September 15, 2006). After evaluating Kentucky's SIP submittal requesting redesignation, EPA has determined that it meets the redesignation criteria set forth in section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. EPA believes that the redesignation request and monitoring data demonstrate that the Boyd County portion of the Huntington-Ashland area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard.

EPA is also proposing to approve the September 29, 2006, SIP revision containing Kentucky's 8-hour ozone maintenance plan for Boyd County, Kentucky. The maintenance plan includes state MVEBs for 2018, among other requirements. EPA is proposing to approve the 2018 MVEBs for Boyd County because the maintenance plan demonstrates that expected emissions for the area in 2018, including the 2018 MVEBs plus the estimated emissions for all other source categories, will continue to maintain the 8-hour ozone standard.

Further, as part of today's action, EPA is providing the status of its adequacy determination for the 2018 MVEBs for Boyd County in accordance with 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1). Within 24 months from the effective date of EPA's adequacy finding for the MVEBs, or the publication date for the final rule for this action, the transportation partners will need to demonstrate conformity to these new MVEBs pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e) as effectively amended by section 172(c)(2)(E) of the CAA as added by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU), which was signed into law on August 10, 2005.

X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Redesignation of an area to attainment under section 107(d)(3)(e) of the CAA does not impose any new requirements on small entities. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new regulatory requirements on sources. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4).

This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely affects the status of a geographical area, does not impose any new requirements on sources, or allow a state to avoid adopting or implementing other requirements and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant and because the Agency does not have reason to believe that the rule concerns an environmental health risk or safety risk that may disproportionately affect children.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area but does not impose any new requirements on sources. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This proposed rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: May 3, 2007.

J.I. Palmer, Jr.,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. E7–9130 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 070427094–7094–01;I.D. 042407A]

RIN 0648–AV50

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Allocation of Trips to Closed Area II Yellowtail Flounder Special Access Program

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces that the Administrator, Northeast Region, NMFS (Regional Administrator), is proposing to allocate zero trips in the Closed Area (CA) II Yellowtail Flounder Special Access Program (SAP) during the 2007 fishing year (FY) (i.e., May 1, 2007, through April 30, 2008). The Regional Administrator has determined that the available catch of Georges Bank (GB) yellowtail flounder is insufficient to support a minimum level of fishing activity within the CA II Yellowtail Flounder SAP for FY 2007. The intent of this action is to help achieve optimum yield (OY) in the fishery by maximizing the utility of available GB yellowtail flounder TAC throughout FY 2007.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before 5 p.m., local time, May 29, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- Written comments (paper, disk, or CD-ROM) should be sent to Patricia A. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, 1 Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope, ''Comments on CA II YT SAP.''
- Comments also may be sent via facsimile (fax) to (978) 978–9135.
- E-mail: *YellowtailSAP@Noaa.gov* Include in the subject line the following ''Comments on CA II YT SAP.''
- Federal e-Rulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Grant, Fishery Management Specialist, phone: (978) 281–9218, fax: (978) 281–9135, e-mail: *Mark.Grant@noaa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The final rule implementing Framework Adjustment (FW) 40B (70 FR 31323; June 1, 2005), authorized the Regional Administrator to allocate the total number of trips into the CA II Yellowtail Flounder SAP based upon several criteria, including: GB yellowtail flounder total allowable catch (TAC) level, as established through the U.S./Canada Resource Sharing Understanding; and the amount of GB yellowtail flounder caught outside of the SAP. A formula was developed in FW 40B to assist the Regional Administrator in determining the appropriate number of trips for this SAP on a yearly basis. The formula is intended to allow the SAP to be adjusted for changing stock conditions to help achieve OY for GB yellowtail flounder.

FW 40B authorized the Regional Administrator to allocate zero trips to this SAP if the available GB yellowtail flounder catch (GB yellowtail flounder TAC projected catch of GB yellowtail flounder outside the SAP) is not sufficient to support 150 trips with a 15,000–lb (6,804–kg) trip limit (i.e., if the available GB yellowtail catch is less than 1,021 mt), as required. The proposed U.S./Canada GB yellowtail flounder TAC for 2007, as recommended by the Transboundary Management Guidance Committee and the Council, is 900 mt (72 FR 10967; March 12, 2007). During FY 2006, vessels fishing outside of the SAP landed over 1,500 mt of GB yellowtail flounder. Therefore, based on the proposed 900–mt U.S./Canada GB yellowtail flounder TAC, assuming similar fishing behavior in 2007, and using the criteria specified under § 648.85(b)(3)(vii) to determine the appropriate number of trips for FY 2007, the Regional Administrator has determined that there will be insufficient GB yellowtail flounder TAC to support the CA II Yellowtail Flounder SAP for FY 2007 (900 mt – 1,500 mt <1,020 mt). Therefore, a limit of zero trips is proposed for FY 2007.

Classification

Pursuant to section 304 (b)(1)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, I have determined that this proposed rule is consistent with the NE Multispecies FMP, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and other applicable law, subject to further consideration after public comment.

This proposed rule has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866.

The Chief Counsel for Regulation of the Department of Commerce certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA) that this proposed rule, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. As a result, an initial regulatory flexibility analysis is not required and none has been prepared.

The SBA size standard for small commercial fishing entities is $ 4.0 million in gross receipts. Individuals that would be impacted by this proposed action include all limited access NE multispecies DAS permit holders. All commercial fishing entities affected by this proposed rule would fall under the SBA size standard for small commercial fishing entities and there would be no disproportionate impacts between small and large entities. The proposed action would affect a substantial number of small entities, as approximately 66 percent of the vessels affected by this action (i.e., 100 out of 150) had participated in the CA II Yellowtail Flounder SAP when it was open during FY 2004. However, the proposed action will not significantly reduce profit for affected vessels.

The proposed allocation of zero trips into the SAP would help ensure that the GB yellowtail flounder TAC is available throughout the fishing year, minimizing the impacts of depressed prices that could otherwise be caused by temporary floods of yellowtail flounder on the market, and therefore would help avoid the premature closing of the Eastern U.S./Canada Area due to catching the available GB yellowtail flounder TAC. This would enable vessels greater opportunity to fully harvest the available GB cod and GB haddock TAC allocated to the Eastern U.S./Canada Area and to achieve the full economic benefit from the U.S./Canada Management Area by more efficiently using the small GB yellowtail flounder TAC. Analysis prepared for FW 40B indicates that flexibility for vessels to target species other than yellowtail flounder is seen as critical to maintaining the profitability of vessel operations within the U.S./Canada

Management Area, including the SAP, given the costs associated with fishing far offshore. Because the proposed action would maintain access to the Eastern U.S./Canada Area throughout the fishing year, this action attempts to preserve the flexibility for vessels to operate in an efficient and cost-effective manner that would maximize the profitability of vessel operations. Since the SAP was closed to fishing for FY 2006, there would be no change in profitability to individual vessels (compared to last year) resulting from the proposed zero allocation, thus, no economic impact to affected small harvesters.

This proposed rule does not contain any new, nor revised existing reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: May 7, 2007.

William T. Hogarth,

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9092 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 665

[Docket No. 070427093–7093–01; I.D. 041807A]

RIN 0648–AV55

Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; Control Date

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; notification of control date; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces that anyone who enters the Hawaii-based pelagic charter fishery after March 16, 2007 (the ''control date''), is not guaranteed future participation in the fishery if the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) recommends, and NMFS approves, a program that limits entry into the fishery, or other fishery management measures. The Council is concerned about expansion of the Hawaii-based pelagic charter fishery and the potential resultant impacts on billfish and other pelagic fishes.

DATES: Comments must be submitted in writing by July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this action, identified by 0648–AV55, by any of the following methods:

- E-mail: *AV55ControlCharter@noaa.gov*. Include ''AV55'' in the subject line of the e-mail comment. Comments sent via e-mail, including all attachments, must not exceed a 10 megabyte file size.
- Federal e-Rulemaking portal: *www.regulations.gov*. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- Mail: William L. Robinson, Regional Administrator, NMFS Pacific Islands Region (PIR), 1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110, Honolulu, HI 96814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Harman, NMFS PIR, 808–944–2234.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: At its 137th meeting held from March 13–16, 2007, the Council adopted a control date of March 16, 2007, applicable to persons who are contemplating entering the Hawaii-based charter fishery for pelagic fishes. The purpose of the control date is to notify fishermen that after March 16, 2007, they may not be guaranteed access to the fishery if the Council recommends, and NMFS approves, establishing a limited entry program or other measures to manage the fishery. The Council has not yet recommended limiting new entry or imposing any other management measures in this fishery.

Establishment of a control date responds to the Council's concern over any significant expansion of the Hawaii-based pelagic charter fishery, and its potential to impact billfish and other pelagic fishes. This concern is focused on the Kona coast of the island of Hawaii, where there is a planned expansion of the Honokohau Harbor. A larger harbor could provide more berths for charter fishing vessels, with a resulting increase in fishing effort for pelagic fishes, such as blue marlin (Makaira mazara). State of Hawaii fishery data indicate that blue marlin catch per unit effort from Kona-based pelagic charter fishing has declined significantly over the past 20 years. Similar trends are also apparent for pelagic charter fishing data from the other Hawaiian islands.

Pelagic charter fishing, conducted from small vessels that primarily target billfishes and tunas and are chartered for a fee, is a notable component of tourism in Hawaii. Total generated revenues were estimated at $17 million in 1990, and $16.5 million in 1992. The industry attracted an estimated 77,000 annual participants in 1994, and employed approximately 400 captains and crew members in 1997. Because at least a portion of the catch is typically sold, pelagic charter fishing in Hawaii is classified as a commercial fishery, requiring State of Hawaii commercial marine licenses and catch reporting. The State of Hawaii issued 121 commercial marine licenses to vessels for pelagic charter fishing in 2005, and the reported catch from pelagic charter vessels in 2005 was 478,650 lb (217,112 kg). In 2006, 119 licensed fishermen submitted fishing reports that reported a total of 9,535 charter trips, or an average of 80.1 trips per vessel.

The March 16, 2007, control date adopted by the Council complements a control date of June 2, 2005, established for non-longline commercial pelagic fisheries in Hawaii (70 FR 47781, August 15, 2005) in response to concerns about overfishing of bigeye tuna Pacific-wide and yellowfin tuna in the central and western Pacific.

Control dates are intended to discourage speculative entry into fisheries, as new participants entering the fisheries after the control date are put on notice that they are not guaranteed future participation in the fisheries. Establishment of this control date does not commit the Council or NMFS to any particular management regime or criteria for entry into the Hawaii-based pelagic charter fishery. Fishermen are not guaranteed future participation in the fishery, regardless of their level of participation before or after the control date. The Council may choose a different control date, or it may choose a management regime that does not involve a control date. Other criteria, such as documentation of landings or sales, may be used to determine eligibility for participation in a limited access fishery. The Council or NMFS also may choose to take no further action to control entry or access to the fishery, in which case the control date may be rescinded.

Classification

This advance notice of proposed rulemaking has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: May 7, 2007.

William T. Hogarth,

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9090 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 72, No. 91
Friday, May 11, 2007

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

May 8, 2007.

The Department of Agriculture has submitted the following information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to 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 should be addressed to: Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.GOV* or fax (202) 395–5806 and to Departmental Clearance Office, USDA, OCIO, Mail Stop 7602, Washington, DC 20250–7602. Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling (202) 720–8958.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Title: Importation of Clementines, Mandarins, and Tangerines from Chile.

OMB Control Number: 0579–0242.

Summary of Collection: Under the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701–7772), the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to carry out operations or measures to detect, eradicate, suppress, control, prevent, or retard the spread of plant pests new to the United States or not known to be widely distributed throughout the United States. The regulations in ''Subpart—Fruits and Vegetables'' (7 CFR 319.56 through 319.56–8) prohibit or restrict the importation of fruits and vegetables into the United States from certain parts of the world, to prevent the introduction and dissemination of plant pests, including fruit flies.

Need and Use of the Information: The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) requires that some plants or plant products are accompanied by a phytosanitary inspection certificate that is completed by plant health officials in the originating or transiting country. APHIS will use the information on this certificate to determine the pest condition of the shipment at the time of inspection in the foreign country. Without the information, all shipments would need to be inspected very thoroughly, thereby requiring considerable more time, this would slow the clearance of international shipments.

Description of Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 19.

Frequency of Responses: Reporting: On occasion.

Total Burden Hours: 147.

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Title: Inspection, Licensing, and Procurement of Animals.

OMB Control Number: 0579–0254.

Summary of Collection: The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) (7 U.S.C. 2131 *et seq.*) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate standards and other requirements governing the humane handling, housing, care, treatment, and transportation of certain animals by dealers, research facilities, exhibitors, carriers, and intermediate handlers. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has the responsibility to enforce the AWA and to regulate the humane care and handling of most warm-blooded animals used for research or exhibition purposes, sold as pets, or transported in commerce. APHIS will collect information using several forms.

Need and Use of the Information: APHIS will collect health certificates, program of veterinary care, application for license and record of acquisition, disposition and transportation of animals. The information is used to ensure those dealers, exhibitors, research facilities, carriers, etc., are in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act and regulations and standards promulgated under this authority of the Act.

Description of Respondents: Individuals or households.

Number of Respondents: 89.

Frequency of Responses: Recordkeeping; Reporting: On occasion.

Total Burden Hours: 41.

Ruth Brown,

Departmental Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9119 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Emergency and Temporary Storage of Agricultural Commodities

AGENCY: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) is taking actions to ensure adequate availability of commercial warehouse storage space for the 2007 crops and for producers seeking warehouse-stored marketing assistance loans for eligible commodities. CCC is announcing authorization, under certain conditions, of emergency and temporary storage for the 2007 crops of wheat, corn, sorghum and feed grains, and temporary storage for the 2007 crops of soybeans, rice and other commodities deemed storable by CCC. The authorizations include agricultural commodities stored by

warehouse operators licensed under the U.S. Warehouse Act (USWA) and those warehouse operators who store commodities pledged as collateral for Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) marketing assistance loans and issue warehouse receipts for such commodities in emergency or temporary storage.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 11, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger Hinkle, Warehouse and Inventory Division, Farm Service Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., STOP 0553, Washington, DC 20250–0553, telephone (202) 720–7433, FAX (202) 690–3123, e-mail: *Roger.Hinkle@wdc.usda.gov*. Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication for regulatory information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

To be eligible for a Marketing Assistance Loan under the loan provisions of 7 CFR part 1421, an eligible commodity must be stored in approved storage, which is either on-farm storage or an approved warehouse that meets the CCC standards for approval of warehouses. Further, in accordance with the CCC Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 *et seq.*), CCC enters into storage agreements with commercial warehouse operators to provide for the storage of commodities owned by CCC or pledged as security to CCC for marketing assistance loans. To ease the demands made on approved warehouse space for the 2007 crops, CCC will accept as collateral for marketing assistance loans the emergency and temporary storage of wheat, corn, sorghum and feed grains and temporary storage of soybeans, rice and other commodities deemed storable by CCC for which warehouse receipts are issued by a warehouse operator that is storing such commodity in emergency or temporary storage if the warehouse has executed a storage agreement with CCC and if the warehouse is either:

1. A federally-licensed warehouse under the USWA and is in compliance with the provisions of its USWA license; or

2. For all other warehouses, the warehouse operator is in compliance with State laws allowing emergency or temporary storage of such commodities.

USWA Emergency Storage Requirements

Emergency storage is limited to wheat, corn, sorghum and feed grains unless otherwise allowed by the USWA. The warehouse operator may use such space from the time of initial licensing until March 31, 2008. Emergency storage space must be operated in conjunction with a USWA-licensed warehouse. In addition, warehouse operators requesting emergency storage space under the USWA must:

1. Receive USWA's authorization for the use of emergency storage space;

2. Meet all USWA security, net worth, bonding, and insurance requirements as required for conventional storage space;

3. Provide written justification that a need for emergency storage exists in the local area including the exact location, kind of commodity and quantity requested;

4. Meet USWA's requirement that emergency storage space be accessible for examination purposes;

5. Receive USWA authorization for the emergency storage space prior to using such space;

6. Maintain a separate inventory record of all commodities stored in emergency storage space, as well as accounting for such commodities in their Daily Position Record (DPR);

7. Agree that all emergency storage space will be deleted from the license no later than March 31, 2008;

8. Agree to move all commodities stored in emergency storage space into licensed space by that date;

9. Notify USWA in writing when commodities are moved into licensed space; and

10. If the warehouse chooses to continue using the emergency storage space for company-owned commodities after that date, the warehouse operator shall:

- Remove that quantity of the commodity from the warehouse's official records,
- Not use the commodity to cover the storage or warehouse receipted obligations of the warehouse, and
- Agree that the quantity will not be included in any warehouse examination conducted by CCC.

USWA Temporary Storage Requirements

The warehouse operator may use such space from the time of initial licensing until March 31, 2008, for soybeans, rice and other commodities deemed storable by CCC and until July 1, 2008, for wheat, corn, sorghum and feed grains. Temporary storage structures must be operated in conjunction with a USWA-licensed warehouse. In addition:

1. Asphalt, concrete, or other approved base material must be used;

2. Rigid self-supporting sidewalls must be used;

3. Aeration must be provided;

4. Acceptable covering, as determined by CCC, must be provided;

5. Receive USWA's authorization for the use of temporary storage;

6. Meet all USWA security, net worth, bonding, and insurance requirements as required for conventional storage space;

7. Warehouse operators must maintain a separate record of all commodities stored in temporary storage space and must account for such commodities in their DPR;

8. Agree to move all commodities stored in temporary storage space into licensed space by its respective final date;

9. Notify USWA in writing when commodities are moved into licensed space; and

10. If the warehouse chooses to continue using the temporary storage space for company-owned commodities after that date, the warehouse operator shall:

- Remove that quantity of the commodity from the warehouse's official records,
- Not use the commodity to cover the storage or warehouse receipted obligations of the warehouse, and
- Agree that the quantity will not be included in any warehouse examination conducted by CCC.

Application for Emergency and Temporary Storage

USWA licensees should direct questions regarding the use of emergency or temporary storage to Terry Chapman, Chief, Licensing Branch, Warehouse License and Examination Division, at: Kansas City Commodity Office, Mail Stop 9148, P.O. Box 419205 Kansas City, MO 64141–6205, telephone: 816–926–6474; facsimile: 816–926–1774. E-mail: *terry.chapman@kcc.usda.gov*.

All other warehouse operators should direct questions regarding the use of emergency or temporary storage to the Chief of the Storage Contract Branch, Bulk Commodities Division, Kansas City Commodity Office—MAIL STOP 8748, PO Box 419205, Kansas City, Missouri 64141–6205, Telephone: (816) 926–6446—Facsimile: (816) 926–1426 or (816) 823–1804; E-mail: *bcdscd@kcc.usda.gov*.

Warehouse Operator's Liability

The authorization and licensing of emergency and temporary storage space does not relieve warehouse operators of their obligations under the USWA.

Warehouse operators are responsible for the quantity and quality of commodities stored in emergency and temporary storage space to the same extent as their liability for licensed storage space. All commodities stored in emergency and temporary storage space are considered a part of the warehouse operator's commingled inventory.

Warehouse Security

CCC strongly recommends that warehouse operators review their warehouse security plans and conduct a prudent risk assessment in connection with their application for emergency and temporary storage space. Warehouse operators may want to pay particular attention to threats that may not have been considered significant in the past and consider restricting access to facilities to authorized personnel only.

Signed in Washington, DC, on April 26, 2007.

Teresa C. Lasseter,

Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. E7–9121 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farm Service Agency

Information Collection: Measurement Service Requests

AGENCY: Farm Service Agency, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; Request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Farm Service Agency (FSA) is seeking comments from all interested individuals and organizations on a new information collection associated with the Measurement Service Requests.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before July 10, 2007 to be assured consideration.

ADDRESSES: The comments should be addressed to Sandy Bryant, Common Provisions Branch Chief, USDA, FSA, Farm Programs, Production Emergencies and Compliance Division, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., STOP 0517, Washington, DC 20250–0523. The comments also may be submitted by e-mail to: *Joe.Lewis@wdc.usda.gov*. The comments should be also sent to the Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joe Lewis, USDA, Farm Service Agency, Production Emergencies and Compliance Division, (202) 720–0795 and *Eloise.Taylor@wdc.usda.gov*. Comments should include the OMB number and title of the information collection.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Description of Information Collection

Title: Management Service Requests (FSA–409).

OMB Control Number: 0560–NEW.

Type of Request: New Information Collection.

Abstract: The producers may request measurement services from the FSA using form FSA–409, Measurement Service Records. The measurement service requests, though not required for program participation, are customarily provided by the County Office. The request may include staking, and referencing and measurement after planting, and bin or quantity measurements in accordance with 7 CFR part 718. Information determined by the FSA during a farm visit for measurement services is reported on the FSA–409. Mandatory fees are assessed by the County Office to recover costs associated with a farm visit to perform these services.

Estimate of Annual Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average .50 hours per response.

Respondents: Producers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 135,000.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.0.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 20,250 hours.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to 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.

All comments received in response to this notice, including names and addresses when provided, will be a matter of public record. Comments will be summarized and included in the submission for Office of Management and Budget approval.

Signed in Washington, DC on May 2, 2007.

Teresa C. Lasseter,

Administrator, Farm Service Agency.

[FR Doc. E7–9077 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

Notice of a Request for a Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Department's intention to request a revision for a currently approved information collection in support of the Export Sales Reporting program.

DATES: Comments should be submitted no later than July 10, 2007.

Additional Information and Comments: Contact Peter W. Burr, Export Sales Reporting, Branch Chief, Stop 1021, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250–1021, telephone; (202) 720–9209, e-mal: *esr@fas.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Export Sales Reporting Program.

OMB Number: 0551–0007.

Expiration Date of Approval: October 31, 2007.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: Section 602 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, requires the reporting of information pertaining to contracts for export sale of certain specified agricultural commodities and other commodities that may be designated by the Secretary. In accordance with Sec. 602, individual weekly reports submitted shall remain confidential and shall be compiled and published in compilation form each week following the week of reporting. Any person who knowingly fails to report shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Regulations at 7 CFR part 20 implement the reporting requirements, and prescribe a system for reporting information pertaining to contracts for export sales.

USDA's export sales reporting system was created after the large unexpected purchase of U.S. wheat and corn by the

Soviet Union in 1972. To make sure that all parties involved in the production and export of U.S. grain have access to up-to-date export information, the U.S. Congress mandated as export sales reporting requirements in 1973. Prior to the establishment of the Export Sales Reporting System, it was impossible for the public to obtain information on export sales activity until the actual shipments had taken place. This frequently resulted in considerable delay in the availability of information.

Under the export sales reporting system, U.S. exporters are required to report all large sales of certain designated commodities by 3 p.m. (eastern time) on the next business days after the sale is made. The designated commodities for these daily reports are wheat (by class), barley, corn, grain sorghum, oats, soybeans, soybean cake and meal, and soybean oil. Large sales for all reportable commodities except soybean oil are defined as 100,000 metric tons or more of one commodity in one day to a single destination or 200,000 tons or more of one commodity during the weekly reporting period. Large sales for soybean oil are 200,000 tons and 40,000 tons, respectively.

Weekly reports are also required, regardless of the size of the sales transaction, for all of these commodities, as well as wheat products, rye, flaxseed, linseed oil, sunflowerseed oil, cotton (by staple length), cottonseed, cottonseed cake and meal, cottonseed oil, rice (by class), cattle hides and skins (cattle, calf, and kip), and beef. The reporting week for the export sales reporting system is Friday–Thursday. The Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to add other commodities to this list.

U.S. exporters provide information on the quantity of their sales transactions, the type and class of commodity, the marketing year of shipment, and the destination. They also report any changes in previously reported information, such as cancellations and changes in destinations.

The estimated total annual burden of 31,190 hours in the OMB inventory for the currently approved information collection will be increased by 11,757 hours to 42,947 hours. The estimated increase is based on the growth in U.S. exports of reported commodities during this period.

Estimate of Burden: The average burden, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering data needed, completing forms, and record keeping is estimated to be 30 minutes.

Respondents: All reports of wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, oil seeds, cotton, rice, cattle hides and skins, beef, and any products thereof, and other commodities that the Secretary may designate as produced in the United States.

Estimated number of respondents: 340 for forms FAS 97, 98, 99, and 100.

Requests for Comments: Send comments regarding (a) 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; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Copies of the current information collection may be obtained from Tamoria Thompson-Hall, FAS Information Collection Coordinator, at (202) 690–1690 or e-mail at *Tamoria.Thompson@usda.gov*. Comments may be sent to Peter W. Burr, Office of Trade Programs/Import and Trade Support Programs Division/ Export Sales Reporting, FAS, 1400 Independence Avenue, Stop 1021, SW., Washington, DC 20250–1021 or *esr@fas.usda.gov*, or to the Desk Office for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. Comments can also be hand delivered to Export Sales Reporting, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 456, 1250 Maryland Avenue, Washington, DC 20024. Persons with disabilities who require an alternative means of communication of information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's Target Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD). All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Government Paperwork Elimination Act: FAS is committed to compliance with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act, which requires Government agencies, in general, to provide the public the option of submitting information or transacting business electronically to the maximum extent possible.

Signed at Washington, DC, on April 26, 2007.

Michael W. Yost,

Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.

[FR Doc. 07–2323 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

National Forest System Land Management Planning

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The Forest Service is giving notice of its intent to prepare an environmental impact statement to analyze and disclose potential environmental consequences associated with a National Forest System land management planning rule. This environmental impact statement is being prepared in partial response to an order dated March 30, 2007, in which the United States District Court in *Citizens for Better Forestry et al.* v. *USDA* (N.D. Calif.) enjoined the USDA from implementation and utilization of the National Forest land management planning rule published in 2005 until the agency complies with the court's order.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent via e-mail to *planningrulenoi@fscomments.org*.

Written comments concerning this notice should be addressed to Planning Rule NOI Comments, P.O. Box 162969, Sacramento, CA 95816–2969, or via facsimile to (916) 456–6724.

All comments, including names and addresses, when provided, are placed in the record and are available for public inspection and copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dave Sire, (202) 205–1006, *dsire@fs.fed.us* or Regis Terney, (202) 205–1552, *rterney@fs.fed.us*.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This action responds in part to an order dated March 30, 2007, by the United States District Court in *Citizens for Better Forestry et al.* v. *USDA* (N.D.

Calif.). The court enjoined the USDA from implementing and utilizing the 2005 Rule until it complies with the court's opinion regarding the Administrative Procedures Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act.

While the Agency is not in agreement with the Court's decision, it has decided, in the interest of moving forward with land management planning, to prepare an environmental impact statement to comply with the court order.

Estimated Dates

The draft environmental impact statement is expected June, 2007, and the final environmental impact statement is expected November, 2007.

Purpose and Need for Action

The 2005 Rule at 36 CFR part 219 resulted from a review of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule issued on November 9, 2000 (2000 Rule) by Forest Service personnel at the direction of the Office of the Secretary. The review affirmed much of the 2000 Rule and the underlying concepts of sustainability, monitoring, evaluation, collaboration, and use of science. Although the 2000 Rule was intended to simplify and streamline the development and amendment of land and resource management plans, the review concluded that the 2000 Rule was neither straightforward nor easy to implement. The review found the following:

(1) The 2000 rule has both definitions and analytical requirements that are very complex, unclear, and, therefore, subject to inconsistent implementation across the agency;

(2) Compliance with the regulatory direction on such matters as ecological sustainability and science consistency checks would be difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish; and

(3) The complexity of the 2000 rule makes it difficult and expensive to implement.

Based on the review and over two decades of experience with land management plans, the Agency promulgated a new planning rule that improved upon the 2000 rule by providing a planning process that was more readily understood and that was within the Agency's capability to implement. The 2005 Rule also responded to additional needs identified through public comments received during the rulemaking. Under the 2005 rule:

(1) Land management plans are strategic in nature;

(2) Are adaptive and based on current information and science;

(3) Guide sustainable management of National Forest System lands; and

(4) The public is involved in planning; and

(5) Planning must comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

Proposed Action

The Agency expects to publish a rule for comment in late June.

Possible Alternatives

Other than the Proposed Action and a No Action alternative, additional alternatives to this proposed action have not yet been identified. Issues with and alternatives to the proposed action will be framed during the internal and external scoping and public comment periods in the NEPA process.

Responsible Official

The responsible official is Mark Rey, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250.

Nature of Decision to be Made

The responsible official will promulgate a land management planning rule based on an alternative that meets the agency's purpose and need.

Scoping Process

This Notice of Intent initiates the scoping process in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations (40 CFR part 1500). As part of the scoping process, the Forest Service solicits public comment on the nature and scope of environmental, social, and economic issues that should be analyzed in the draft environmental impact statement. Scoping will include review of comments previously collected during promulgation of the 2005 planning rule (70 FR 1022), agency planning directives (72 FR 4478, 71 FR 10956, 71 FR 5124), and the Agency categorical exclusion for land management planning (71 FR 75481). The nature and scope of the analysis for the draft environmental impact statement will focus on the process for development, revision, and amendment of land management plans, and alternatives to it. Because of the extensive amount of public comment received on the 2005 planning rule, planning directives, and the Agency categorical exclusion for land management planning, no public meetings are planned for this scoping effort.

Comment Requested

Reviewers should provide their comments during the comment period. Timely comments will enable the Agency to analyze and respond to them at one time and to use them in the preparation of the environmental impact statement, thus avoiding undue delay in the decisionmaking process. Furthermore, specific and substantive comments will facilitate meaningful review and consideration. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the Agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Dept. of Transportation* v. *Public Citizen, 541 U.S. 752, 764 (2004).*

Dated: April 27, 2007.

Gregory Smith,

Acting Deputy Chief, National Forest System.

[FR Doc. E7–9078 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Olympic National Forest, Jefferson County, WA; Dosewallips Road Washout Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Revised Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: On August 12, 2005, the USDA Forest Service (FS), Olympic National Forest (ONF), published a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 47171) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Dosewallips Road Washout Project. A revised Notice of Intent was published on August 26, 2005 in **Federal Register** (70 FR 50297). The FS and Western Federal Lands Highway Division (WFLHD) of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) further revise this Notice of Intent as follows. Except for the sections noted, all prior information remains the same.

DATES: The draft EIS is expected to be released in July 2007, and the final EIS is expected to be released in May 2008.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Action

The original proposed action to restore and rebuild the washed out section of Forest Service Road (FSR)

2610 using a low-water crossing has been dropped from further consideration. Instead, the ONF and WFLHD proposed to reestablish road access previously provided by FSR 2610 to ONF and Olympic National Park (ONP) recreational facilities by rerouting the road above its former location along the hill-slope above and to the north of the washout. Approximately 0.8 mile of single-lane road with turnouts would be constructed using standard construction methods. Furthermore, the ONP and WFLHD propose to repair the damage to ONP's Dosewallips Road in the vicinity of Dosewallips River Falls, about 0.85 mile from the ONF/ONP boundary. This proposed action also includes a proposal to amend the Forest Plan only for the proposed repair on FSR 2610.

Possible Alternatives

The potential alternatives have changed since the last Notice of Intent for this proposed action was published. In addition to the proposed action, the possible alternatives to restore access along the damaged section of FSR 2610 are: No action; reroute to restore access to cars, recreational vehicles, and trailers upslope of the damage with an emphasis to minimize the footprint of the road and thereby the resource impacts; and a bridge or causeway to restore access to cars, recreational vehicles and trailers. As in the case of the Proposed Action, the reroute alternative that would minimize the road footprint and impacts also includes proposals to amend the Forest Plan for the repair needed on FSR 2610. Any proposed amendments to the Forest Plan will be identified and analyzed in the EIS. Under all the action alternatives, the ONP proposes to repair the Dosewallips Road near the Dosewallips Falls.

Lead and Cooperative Agencies

The ONF (FS) and WFLHD (FHWA) will be co-lead agencies in preparation and completion of the EIS. The ONP (NPS) will be a cooperating agency in the completion of the EIS.

Responsible Official

Mr. Dale Hom, Forest Supervisor, will be th Responsible Official for the decisions of the FS. Mr. Hom's contact information is Olympic National Forest, 1835 Black Lake Blvd., SW., Suite A, Olympia, WA 98512. Ms. Clara Conner, Division Engineer, will be the Responsible Official for the decisions of FHWA. Ms. Conner's contact information is Western Federal Lands Highway Division, 610 East Fifth St., Vancouver, WA 98661. Mr. Jonathon B. Jarvis, Regional Director of the NPS Pacific West Region, will be the Responsible Official for the decisions of the NPS. However, Mr. William G. Laitner, Park Superintendent, will be the implementing official for the NPS. Mr. Laitner;s contact information is Olympic National Park, 600 East Park Ave., Port Angeles, WA 98362.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Davis, Project Leader, ONF, 1835 Black Lake Blvd., SW., Suite A, Olympia, Washington 98512; phone (360) 956–2375; or e-mail *tedavis@fs.fed.us.*

Dated: May 2, 2007.

Dale Hom,

Forest Supervisor, Olympic National Forest.

[FR Doc. 07–2333 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Ravalli County Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Ravalli County Resource Advisory Committee will be meeting to discuss management of Dams in the Wilderness and hold a short public forum (question and answer session) The meeting is being held pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) and under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–393). The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on May 22, 2007, 6:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Bitterroot National Forest Supervisor Office, Conference Room, 1801 North First Street, Hamilton, Montana. Send written comments to Dan Ritter, District Ranger, Stevensville Ranger District, 88 Main Street, Stevensville, MT 59870. by facsimile (406) 777–7423, or electronically to *dritter@fs.fed.us.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel G. Ritter, Stevensville District Ranger and Designated Federal Officer, Phone: (406) 777–5461.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Barry Paulson,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 07–2332 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Notice of Proposed New Fee Sites; Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, (Title VIII, Pub. L. 108–447)

AGENCY: Mendocino National Forest, USDA Forest Service.

ACTION: Notice of proposed new fee sites.

SUMMARY: The Mendocino National Forest is proposing to charge new fees at 14 developed recreation sites. Fees are assessed based on the level of amenities and services provided, cost of operation and maintenance, market assessment, and public comment. The fees listed are only proposed and will be determined upon further analysis and public comment. Funds from fees would be used for the continued operation and maintenance of these recreation sites.

Pine Mountain Lookout will be available for overnight rental. The rental fee is recommended at $50 per night. Lookout rentals offer a unique experience and are a widely popular offering on National Forests. Pine Mountain was recently restored to maintain the lookout's eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. Fees would continue to help protect and maintain lookouts and their historic integrity.

The following recreation sites are currently fee free but we are recommending fees be charged in the future: Davis Flat Campground, Dixie Glade Campground, Fouts Campground, Lake Red Bluff Boat Launch, Little Stony Campground, Mill Creek Campground, North Forth Campground, Sacramento River Boat Launch, South Fork Campground, Deer Valley Campground, Penny Pines Campground, Howard Lake Campground, Howard Meadows Campground, and Little Doe Campground. Improvements have been made at many of these campgrounds including installing new fire rings, picnic tables and some new toilets. Improvements at these campgrounds were to address sanitation and safety concerns, and improve deteriorating resource conditions and recreation experiences. A financial analysis is being completed to determine fee rates. The proposed fees to help maintain these sites would range between $5 and $8 a campsite.

DATES: New fees would begin after October 1, 2007. The lookout rental will be listed with the National Recreation Reservation Service.

ADDRESSES: Thomas A. Contreras, Forest Supervisor, Mendocino National Forest, 825 N. Humboldt Avenue, Willows, California 95988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jack Horner, Recreation Fee Coordinator, 530–934–3316. Information about proposed fee changes can also be found on the Mendocino National Forest Web site: *http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/mendocino/recreation/index.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Recreation Lands Enhancement Act (Title VII, Pub. L. 108–447) directed the Secretary of Agriculture to publish a six month advance notice in the **Federal Register** whenever new recreation fee areas are established. These new fees will be reviewed by a Recreation Resource Advisory Committee prior to a final decision and implementation.

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Thomas A. Contreras,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 07–2325 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Florence Flood Retarding Structure Supplemental Watershed Plan, Pinal County, AZ

AGENCY: Natural Resources Conservation Service.

ACTION: Notice of a finding of no significant impact.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR part 1500); and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Regulations (7 CFR part 650); the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice that an environmental impact statement is not being prepared for the Florence Flood Retarding Structure (FRS) Supplemental Watershed Plan, Pinal County, Arizona.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David McKay, State Conservationist, USDA–NRCS, 230 North First Avenue, Suite 509, Phoenix, Arizona 85003, telephone (602) 280–8801.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The environmental assessment of this federally assisted action indicates that the project will not cause significant local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. Based on evidence presented, David McKay, State Conservationist, has determined that the preparation and review of an environmental impact statement are not needed for this project.

The project proposes to rehabilitate the Florence FRS to meet NRCS and State of Arizona safety and performance standards.

The Notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency and to various Federal, State, and local agencies and interested parties. Copies of the FONSI are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the environmental assessment are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Don Paulus, Assistant State Conservationist for Programs, at the above address.

No administrative action on implementation of the proposal will be taken until 30 days after the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

(This activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.904, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, and is subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials.)

Dated: May 2, 2007.

David McKay,

State Conservationist.

[FR Doc. E7–9147 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Housing Service

Notice of Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Rural Housing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed collection; comments requested.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Rural Housing Service's (RHS) intention to request an extension for a currently approved information collection in support of the program for Fire and Rescue Loans.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by July 10, 2007 to be assured of consideration.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Derek L. Jones, Loan Specialist, Community Programs Division, RHS, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Stop 0787, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250–0787. Telephone (202) 720–1504.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Fire and Rescue Loans.

OMB Number: 0575–0120.

Expiration Date of Approval: June 30, 2007.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: The Fire and Rescue Loan program is authorized by Section 306 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926) to make loans to public entities, nonprofit corporations, and Indian tribes for the development of community facilities for public use in rural areas and is covered by 7 CFR part 1942–C. The primary regulation for administering the Community Facilities program is 7 CFR part 1942–A (OMB Number 0575–0015) that outlines eligibility, project feasibility, security, and monitoring requirements.

The Community Facilities fire and rescue program has been in existence for many years. This program has financed a wide range of fire and rescue projects varying in size and complexity from construction of a fire station with fire fighting and rescue equipment to financing a 911 emergency system. These facilities are designed to provide fire protection and emergency rescue services to rural communities.

Information will be collected by the field offices from applicants, borrowers, and consultants. This information will be used to determine applicant/borrower eligibility, project feasibility, and to ensure borrowers operate on a sound basis and use funds for authorized purposes. Failure to collect proper information could result in improper determination of eligibility, improper use of funds, and/or unsound loans.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2.15 hours per response.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions, State, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,735.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 2.68.

Estimated Number of Responses: 4,651.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 10,004 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Renita Bolden, Regulations and Paperwork Management Branch, (202) 692–0035.

Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of

information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Rural Housing Service (RHS), including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of RHS's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to 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. Comments may be sent to Renita Bolden, Regulations and Paperwork Management Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, STOP 0742, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Russell T. Davis,

Administrator, Rural Housing Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9128 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–XV–P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Proposed Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Proposed additions to Procurement List.

SUMMARY: The Committee is proposing to add to the Procurement List a product and services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

Comments Must Be Received on or Before: June 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800, 1421 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202–3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR TO SUBMIT COMMENTS CONTACT: Kimberly M. Zeich, Telephone: (703) 603–7740, Fax: (703) 603–0655, or e-mail *CMTEFedReg@jwod.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published pursuant to 41 U.S.C 47(a) (2) and 41 CFR 51–2.3. Its purpose is to provide interested persons an opportunity to submit comments on the proposed actions.

If the Committee approves the proposed additions, the entities of the Federal Government identified in the notice for each product or service will be required to procure the products and services listed below from nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. If approved, the action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the products and services to the Government.

2. If approved, the action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the products and services to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the products and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

Comments on this certification are invited. Commenters should identify the statement(s) underlying the certification on which they are providing additional information.

End of Certification

The following product and services are proposed for addition to Procurement List for production by the nonprofit agencies listed:

Product

Bag, Sand (Cotton).
NSN: 8105–00–782–2709—Bag, Sand.
NPA: Southeast Vocational Alliance, Inc., Houston, TX.
Contracting Activity: Defense Supply Center, Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.

Services

Service Type/Location: Custodial & Grounds Maintenance, Cannons Corners POE, 1295 Cannons Corners Road, Mooers Forks, NY.
Service Type/Location: Custodial & Grounds Maintenance, Churubusco POE, 1219 State Route 189, Churubusco, NY.
NPA: Citizen Advocates, Inc., Malone, NY.
Contracting Activity: Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, Indianapolis, IN.
Service Type/Location: Mailing Services (Pharmacy), VISN–19 Eastern Colorado Health Care System, Denver, CO.
NPA: Jewish Family Service of Colorado, Denver, CO.
Contracting Activity: VISN 19 Eastern Colorado Health Care System (ECHCS), Denver, CO.
Service Type/Location: Consolidated Mailroom Operations, Department of Homeland Security (Metro Washington, DC–VA–MD), Washington, DC.
NPA: ServiceSource, Inc., Alexandria, VA.
Contracting Activity: Department of Homeland Security Headquarters, Washington, DC.

G. John Heyer,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. E7–9115 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Additions and Deletions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Additions to and deletions from Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities, and deletes from the Procurement List products previously furnished by such agencies.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800, 1421 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202–3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR TO SUBMIT COMMENTS CONTACT: Kimberly M. Zeich, Telephone: (703) 603–7740, Fax: (703) 603–0655, or e-mail *CMTEFedReg@jwod.gov.*

Additions

On March 9, 2007 the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (72 FR 10641) of proposed additions to the Procurement List.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the services listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the services to the Government.

2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the services to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

End of Certification

Accordingly, the following services are added to the Procurement List:

Services

Service Type/Location: Furniture Moving Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service, Region 8, 1720 Peachtree Road, NW., Atlanta, GA.
NPA: Bobby Dodd Institute, Inc., Atlanta, GA.
Contracting Activity: U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service, Atlanta, GA.
Service Type/Location: Maintenance/Custodial/Administrative Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service, Caribbean National Forest, Rio Grande, PR.
NPA: The Corporate Source, Inc., New York, NY.
Contracting Activity: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Cleveland, TN.

Deletions

On March 9, 2007 the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (72 FR10641) of proposed deletions to the Procurement List.

After consideration of the relevant matter presented, the Committee has determined that the products listed below are no longer suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action may result in additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities.

2. The action may result in authorizing small entities to furnish the products to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the products deleted from the Procurement List.

End of Certification

Accordingly, the following products are deleted from the Procurement List:

Products

Perforator, Paper, Desk,
NSN: 7520–01–431–6246—Perforator, Paper, Desk.
NSN: 7520–01–431–6252—Perforator, Paper, Desk.
NPA: Foothill Workshop for the Handicapped, Inc., Pasadena, CA.
Contracting Activity: Office Supplies & Paper Products Acquisition Ctr, New York, NY.

G. John Heyer,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. E7–9116 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Khalid Mahmood; In the Matter of Khalid Mahmood, 11505 Blue Ridge Drive, Beltsville, MD 20750, Respondent

Order Relating to Khalid Mahmood

The Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of Commerce (''BIS'') has notified Khalid Mahmood (hereinafter referred to as ''Mahmood'') of its intention to initiate an administrative proceeding against Mahmood pursuant to Section 766.3 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2006)) (''Regulations'') [1] and Section 13(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. sections 2401–2420 (2000)) (''Act''),[2] by issuing a proposed charging letter to Mahmood that alleged that Mahmood committed six violations of the Regulations. Specifically, the charges are:

Charge 1 15 CFR 764.2(d)—Conspiracy To Violate the Regulations

Beginning in or about February 2003 and continuing through in or about December 2004, Mahmood acted in concert with others, known and unknown, to do or bring about an act that violates the Regulations. The purpose of the conspiracy was to export lift truck parts (''parts'') items subject to the Regulations (''EAR 99'' [3]) and the Iranian Transactions Regulations,[4] from the United States to Iran without the required U.S. Government authorization. In furtherance of the conspiracy, Mahmood facilitated the export of parts from the United States through the United Arab Emirates (''UAE'') to Iran. Pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations, authorization was required from the Office of Foreign Assets Control, U.S. Department of Treasury (''OFAC'') before the parts could be exported to Iran. Failure to obtain authorization from OFAC is a violation of the Regulations. In so doing, Mahmood committed one violation of Section 764.2(d) of the Regulations.

Charges 2–6 15 CFR 764.2(b)—Causing the Export of Lift Truck Parts to Iran Without the Required Authorizations

On five occasions between on or about March 28, 2003 and on or about December 18, 2003, Mahmood caused the doing of an act prohibited by the Regulations. Specifically, Mahmood coordinated the shipping of parts, items subject to the Regulations (''EAR 99'') and the Iranian Transactions Regulations, from the United States to Iran through the UAE without the required U.S. Government authorizations. Pursuant to Section 560.204 of the Iranian Transactions Regulations, an export to a third country intended for transshipment to Iran is a transaction subject to the Iranian Transactions Regulations. Pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations, authorization was required from OFAC for the shipment of the parts from the United States to Iran. Failure to obtain authorization from OFAC is a violation of the Regulations. By causing these exports in this manner, Mahmood committed five violations of Section 764.2(b) of the Regulations.

[1] The violations charged occurred between 2003 and 2004. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 2003–2004 versions of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR part 730–774 (2003–2004)). The 2006 Regulations govern the procedural aspects of the case.

[2] Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of August 2, 2006 (71 FR 44,551 (Aug. 7, 2006)), has continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)) (''IEEPA'').

[3] EAR 99 is a designation for items subject to the Regulations that are not listed on the Commerce Control List.

[4] The Iranian Transactions Regulations are currently codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 31 CFR part 560 (2006).

Whereas, BIS and Mahmood have entered into a Settlement Agreement pursuant to Section 766.18(a) of the Regulations whereby they agreed to settle this matter in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth therein, and

Whereas, I have approved the terms of such Settlement Agreement;

It is therefore ordered:

First, that for a period of ten years from the date of entry of this Order, Khalid Mahmood, 11505 Blue Ridge Drive, Beltsville, MD 20750, and when acting for or on behalf of Mahmood, his representatives or agents (''Denied Person'') may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software, or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''item'') exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Person any items subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Mahmood by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of the Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

Fifth, that the proposed charging letter, the Settlement Agreement, and this Order shall be made available to the public.

Sixth, that this Order shall be served on the Denied Person and on BIS, and shall be published in the Federal Register.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

Entered this 2nd day of May 2007.

Darryl W. Jackson,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 07–2322 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–OT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–570–846

Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Extension of the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 11, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Moats or Blanche Ziv, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5047 and (202) 482–4207, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') received a timely request from Longkou Qizheng Auto Parts Co., Ltd. (''Qizheng''), in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(c), to conduct a semiannual new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 18740 (April 17, 1997). On November 30, 2006, the Department found that the request for review with respect to Qizheng met all of the regulatory requirements set forth in 19 CFR 351.214(b) and initiated a semiannual new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors for the April 1, 2006, through September 30, 2006, period. *See Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 69203 (November 30, 2006). On March 8, 2007, the Department expanded the period of review (''POR'') of this semiannual new shipper review through October 30, 2006, to capture the entry corresponding to Qizheng's first sale to the United States. See Memorandum to Wendy J. Frankel, Office Director, through Blanche Ziv, Program Manager, from Jennifer Moats, Analyst, Regarding Expansion of the Period of Review. Therefore, the POR for the semiannual new shipper review of Qizheng is April 1, 2006, through October 30, 2006. The preliminary results are currently due no later than May 21, 2007.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1) require the Department to issue the preliminary results of a new shipper review within 180 days after the date on which the new shipper review was initiated and final results of a review within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued. The Department may, however, extend the time period for completion of the preliminary results of a new shipper review to 300 days if it determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated. *See* 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2) and 751 (a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

The Department has determined that the review is extraordinarily complicated, as the Department must gather additional information, issue additional supplemental questionnaires, and conduct verification of the responses. Based on the timing of the case and the additional information that must be gathered and verified, the preliminary results of this new shipper review cannot be completed within the statutory time limit of 180 days. Accordingly, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results of the new shipper review of Qizheng to 300 days. *See* 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2). The preliminary results will now be due no later than September 18, 2007, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2). The final results will be due 90 days after the date of issuance of the preliminary results, unless extended.

We are issuing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–9132 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–848]

Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic's of China: Rescission of New Shipper Reviews

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On March 7, 2007, the Department of Commerce (''Department'') published its preliminary notice of its intent to rescind the 2005/2006 simi-annual new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). *See Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Notice of Intent to Rescind New Shipper Reviews,* 72 FR 10148 (March 7, 2007) (''Preliminary Rescission''). As we received no comments or new information after the publication of the *Preliminary Rescission,* we have made no changes to our preliminary decision to rescind the new shipper reviews of Nanjing Merry Trading Co., Ltd. (''Nanjing Merry''), Leping Lotai Foods Co., Ltd. (''Leping Lotai''), Weishan Hongrun Aquatic Food Co., Ltd. (''Weishan Hongrun''), and Shanghai Strong International Trading Co., Ltd. (''Shanghai Strong'').

EFFECTIVE DATES: May 11, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Erin Begnal or Scot Fullerton, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1442 or (202) 482–1386, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 7, 2007, the Department published its preliminary notice of its intent to rescind the 2005/2006 semi-annual new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC, and invited parties to comment on the preliminary rescission. *See Preliminary Rescission.* In the *Preliminary Rescission*, the Department indicated, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii), that interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of the *Preliminary Rescission.* Additionally, the Department indicated that any interested party may also request a hearing within 30 days of publication of the *Preliminary Rescission,* in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c).

As of April 9, 2007, however, 30 days after publication of the *Preliminary Rescission,* no interested party submitted a case brief or requested a hearing be held in the context of the above-referenced new shipper reviews.[1]

Scope of Order

The product covered by this antidumping duty order is freshwater crawfish tail meat, in all its forms (whether washed or with fat on, whether purged or unpurged), grades, and sizes; whether frozen, fresh, or chilled; and regardless or how it is packed, preserved, or prepared. Excluded from the scope of the order are live crawfish and other whole crawfish, whether boiled, frozen, fresh, or chilled. Also excluded are saltwater crawfish and any type, and parts thereof. Freshwater crawfish tail meat is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') under item numbers 1605.40.10.10 and 1605.40.10.90, which are the HTSUS numbers for prepared foodstuffs, indicating peeled crawfish tail meat and other, as introduced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') in 2000, and HTSUS numbers 0306.19.00.10 and 0306.29.00.00, which are reserved for fish and crustaceans in general. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is September 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006.

Analysis of Comments Received

As noted above, we received no comments from interested parties in response to the *Preliminary Rescission.* While the Department normally issues a separate Issues and Decision Memorandum which accompanies a final results/rescission notice published in the **Federal Register**, since no briefs were submitted in the above-referenced new shipper reviews, a separate memorandum is not required.

Final Rescission

Concurrent with the *Preliminary Rescission,* the Department issued a memorandum detailing our analysis of the *bona fides* of Weishan Hongrun's U.S. sale and our preliminary decision to rescind the review based on the totality of the circumstances of the sale. *See* Memorandum to James C. Doyle, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, through Christopher D. Riker, Program Manager, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, from Scot Fullerton, Senior Case Analyst, AD/CVD

[1] Although 30 days after publication of the *Preliminary Rescission* was April 7, 2007, this date fell on a Saturday. Therefore, case briefs and hearing requests were not due until close of business, the next business day (*i.e.,* Monday, April 9, 2007), as the agency's regulations clarify that where the applicable time limit expires on a non-business day, the Secretary will accept documents that are filed on the next business day. *See* 19 CFR 351.303(b).

Operations, Office 9, titled 2005/2006 antidumping Duty New Shipper Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Bona Fide analysis of the Sale(s) Reported by Weishan Hongrun Aquatic Food Co., Ltd. (February 22, 2007). The Department received no comments on its preliminary decision to rescind the new shipper review of Weishan Hongrun, based on the totality of the circumstances of the sale and the non-*bona fide* nature of the transaction.

Additionally, prior to the *Preliminary Rescission,* Leping Lotai, Nanjing Merry, and Shanghai Strong all submitted letters to the Department indicating they would not permit verification of the information placed on the record of the reviews. By not permitting the Department to verify the accuracy of the information each submitted to the Department, Leping Lotai, Nanjing Merry, and Shanghai Strong each failed to establish that they qualified for a separate rate. *See* Memorandum to James C. Doyle, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, from Scot T. Fullerton and Prentiss Lee Smith, Case Analysis, through Christopher D. Riker, Program Manager, titled Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from The People's Republic of China: Intent to Rescind the New Shipper Review of Leping Lotai Foods Co. (February 22, 2007); Memorandum to James C. Doyle, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, from Scot T. Fullerton and Prentiss Lee Smith, Case analysts, through Christopher D. Riker, Program Manager, titled Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from The People's Republic of China: Intent to Rescind the New Shipper Review of nanjing Merry Trading Co., Ltd. (February 22, 2007); Memorandum to James C. Doyle, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, from Scot T. Fullerton and Prentiss Lee Smith, Case analysts, through Christopher D. Riker, Program Manager, titled Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from The People's Republic of China: Intent to Rescind the New Shipper Review of Shanghai Strong International Trading Co., Ltd. (February 22, 2007).

To establish whether a company operating in a non-market economy (''NME'') is sufficiently independent from the Government to be eligible for a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers From the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991), as amplified by the *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994). Under the separate rates criteria, the Department assigns separate rates in NME cases only if the respondent can demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* governmental control over export activities.

By failing to allow the Department to verify the accuracy of their submissions, Leping Lotai, Nanjing Merry, and Shanghai Strong did not demonstrate that they are free of government control and, therefore, are not eligible to receive a separate rate. In the notices of initiation, the Department stated that an exporter unable to demonstrate the company's eligibility for a separate rate does not meet the requirements of 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii) and its new shipper review will be rescinded. *See Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews,* 71 FR 26453 (May 5, 2006) (''*May 5, 2006, Initiation Notice*''); *see also Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review,* 71 FR 30866 (May 31, 2006). Therefore, the Department preliminarily rescinded the new shipper reviews of Leping Lotai, Nanjing Merry, and Shanghai Strong. The Department received no comments on its preliminary decision that Leping Lotai's, Nanjing Merry's, and Shanghai Strong's reviews should be rescinded as they did not qualify for a separate rate.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

We have made no changes to our preliminary decision to rescind the new shipper reviews of Weishan Hongrun, Leping Lotai, Nanjing Merry and Shanghai Strong.

Assessment of Antidumping Duties

A cash deposit of 223.01 percent *ad valorem* shall be collected for any entries produced/exported by Leping Lotai/Leping Lotai, Anhui Hengda Foodstuffs Co. Ltd./Nanjing Merry, Weishan Hongrun/Weishan Hongrun, and Jiangsu Hongda Aquatic Food Co., Ltd./Shanghai Strong.[2] The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of the publication of this notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

These reviews and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1), 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 07–2340 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[2] The *Preliminary Rescission* erroneously indicated that Nanjing Merry produced the subject merchandise it exported during the POR. This merchandise, in fact, was produced by Anhui Hengda Foodstuffs Co. Ltd. *See, e.g., May 5, 2006, Initiation Notice.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Minority Business Development Agency

[Docket No: 070503107–7108–01]

Solicitation of Applications for the North Carolina, New Mexico and Oklahoma Native American Business Enterprise Centers (NABECs)

AGENCY: Minority Business Development Agency, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 15 U.S.C. 1512 and Executive Order 11625, the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) is soliciting competitive applications from organizations to operate a Native American Business Enterprise Center (NABEC) in the specified locations and geographical service areas (see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**). The NABEC operates through the use of business consultants and provides a range of technical assistance services directly to Native American- and other minority-owned businesses. Responsibility for ensuring that applications in response to this competitive solicitation are complete and received by MBDA on time is the sole responsibility of the applicant. Applications submitted must be to operate a NABEC and to provide business consultation to eligible clients. Applications that do not meet these requirements will be rejected. This is not a grant program to help start an individual business.

DATES: The closing date for receipt of applications is Friday, June 15, 2007. Completed applications must be received by MBDA no later than 5 p.m.

Eastern Daylight Savings Time (EDT) at the address below for paper submission or at *www.Grants.gov* for electronic submission. The due date and time is the same for electronic submissions as it is for paper submissions. The date that applications will be deemed to have been submitted electronically shall be the date and time received at Grants.gov. Applicants should save and print the proof of submission they receive from Grants.gov. Applications received after the closing date will not be considered. Anticipated time for processing is ninety (90) days from the date of publication of this notice. MBDA anticipates that awards for the North Carolina NABEC, New Mexico NABEC and the Oklahoma NABEC will be made with a start date of August 1, 2007.

Pre-Application Conference: In connection with this solicitation, a pre-application teleconference will be held on Friday, May 18, 2007. Participants must register at least 24 hours in advance of the teleconference. Please visit the MBDA Internet Portal at *www.mbda.gov* (MBDA Portal) for registration instructions. A copy of the MBDA panel evaluation tool and a summary of the questions and answers from the pre-application conference will be available through the MBDA Portal as soon as practicable following the conference.

ADDRESSES: (1a) Paper Submission—If Mailed: If the application is sent by postal mail or overnight delivery service by the applicant or its representative, one (1) signed original plus two (2) copies of the application must be submitted. Completed application packages must be mailed to: Office of Business Development—NABEC Program, Office of Executive Secretariat, HCHB, Room 5063, Minority Business Development Agency, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Applicants are advised that Department of Commerce mail security measures may delay receipt of United States Postal Service mail for up to two weeks. Applicants may wish to use a guaranteed overnight delivery service. Department of Commerce delivery policies for Federal Express, UPS, and DHL overnight services require the packages to be sent to the address above.

(1b) Paper Submission—If Hand-Delivered: If the application is hand-delivered by the applicant or his/her representative, one (1) signed original plus two (2) copies of the application must be delivered to: U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency, Office of Business Development—NABEC Program (extension 1940), HCHB, Room 1874, Entrance #10, 15th Street, NW., Washington, DC (Between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues).

U.S. Department of Commerce ''hand-delivery'' policies state that Federal Express, UPS, and DHL overnight services submitted to the address listed above (Entrance #10) cannot be accepted. These policies should be taken into consideration when utilizing their services. MBDA will not accept applications that are submitted by the deadline but rejected due to Departmental hand-delivery policies. The applicant must adhere to these policies in order for his/her application to receive consideration for award.

(2) Electronic Submission: Applicants are encouraged to submit their proposal electronically at *http://www.Grants.gov*. Electronic submissions should be made in accordance with the instructions available at Grants.gov (see *http://www.grants.gov/ForApplicants* for detailed information). MBDA strongly recommends that applicants not wait until the application deadline date to begin the application process through Grants.gov, in some cases, the process for completing an online application may require 3–5 working days.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, please visit MBDA's Minority Business Internet Portal at *http://www.mbda.gov*. Paper applications and Standard Forms (SF) may be obtained by contacting the MBDA National Enterprise Center (NEC) for the area where the Applicant is located (see Agency Contacts below) or by visiting the MBDA Portal at *www.mbda.gov*. Standard Forms 424, 424A, 424B can also be obtained at *http://www.Grants.gov*. Forms CD–511 and CD–346 may be obtained at *www.doc.gov/forms*. Form SF–LLL can be obtained at *www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants*.

Agency Contacts:

1. Office of Business Development, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 5075, Washington, DC 20230. Contact: Efrain Gonzalez, Program Manager at 202–482–1940.

2. Dallas National Enterprise Center (DNEC), 1100 Commerce Street, Room 726, Dallas, TX 75242. This region covers the states of Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. Contact: John Iglehart, Regional Director, DNEC at 214–767–8001.

3. Atlanta National Enterprise Center (ANEC), 401 W. Peachtree Street, NW., Suite 1715, Atlanta, GA 30308. This region covers the states of North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina and Tennessee. It also covers Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Contact: John Iglehart, Acting Regional Director, ANEC at 404–730–3300.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

MBDA published a **Federal Register** notice on August 29, 2003 (68 FR 51981), as amended on September 30, 2003 (68 FR 56267), February 11, 2004 (69 FR 6644) and February 19, 2004 (69 FR 7726), soliciting competitive applications for operators of the following eight NABDCs (now NABECs): Arizona Statewide NABDC, California Statewide NABDC, Minnesota/Iowa Statewide NABDC, New Mexico Statewide NABDC, North Carolina/Cherokee/Ashville NABDC, North/South Dakota Statewide NABDC, Northwest NABDC and the Oklahoma Statewide NABDC. This competition resulted in financial assistance awards (cooperative agreements) being issued for all eight locations, with a three-year award period of January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2006.

On September 6, 2006, MBDA published a **Federal Register** notice (71 FR 52529) soliciting competitive applications for operators of four regional NABECs (in place of the eight prior NABECs) for the next three-year award period commencing January 1, 2007. However, on October 25, 2006, MBDA published a **Federal Register** notice (71 FR 62420) (i) cancelling the September 6, 2006 solicitation and (ii) amending the original competitive solicitation to extend the total project award period for all eight of the original NABECs from three years to four years. MBDA took these actions in order to provide the Agency with a sufficient opportunity to solicit input from its stakeholders regarding any proposed program changes to be implemented during the next three-year award period. Operators of five of the eight NABECs accepted MBDA's invitation to extend the original award period for an additional year, while the operators of the North Carolina/Ashville/Cherokee NABEC, New Mexico Statewide NABEC and Oklahoma Statewide NABEC declined MBDA's invitation.

This Notice solicits competitive applications for the North Carolina NABEC, New Mexico NABEC and the Oklahoma NABEC. This Notice replaces in its entirety the previously published competitive solicitation for the North Carolina NABEC, New Mexico NABEC and Oklahoma NABEC projects, although it generally adheres to

previous programmatic requirements with updates being made to the computer requirements.

Geographic Service Areas

The NABEC will be located and will provide services in the following geographic areas:

NABEC name	Location of NABEC	Geographic service area
North Carolina NABEC	Cherokee/Asheville, Charlotte, Lumberton or Pembroke, NC.	State of North Carolina.
New Mexico NABEC	Albuquerque, Farmington or Gallup, NM	State of New Mexico.
Oklahoma NABEC	Oklahoma City or Tulsa, OK	State of Oklahoma.

Electronic Access

A link to the full text of the Announcement of Federal Funding Opportunity (FFO) for this solicitation may be accessed at *http://www.Grants.gov*, at *http://www.mbda.gov*, or by contacting the appropriate MBDA representative identified above. The FFO contains a full and complete description of the NABEC Program requirements. In order to receive proper consideration, applicants must comply with all information and requirements contained in the FFO. Applicants will be able to access, download and submit electronic grant applications for the NABEC Program in this announcement at *http://www.Grants.gov*. MBDA strongly recommends that applicants not wait until the application deadline date to begin the application process through Grants.gov as in some cases the process for completing an online application may require additional time (e.g., 3–5 working days). The date that applications will be deemed to have been submitted electronically shall be the date and time received at Grants.gov. Applicants should save and print the proof of submission they receive from Grants.gov. Applications received after the closing date and time will not be considered.

Funding Priorities

Preference may be given during the selection process to applications which address the following MBDA funding priorities:

(a) Applicants who submit proposals with a scope of work for the project exceeding the minimum work requirements in the FFO;

(b) Applicants who submit proposals that include performance goals that exceed the minimum performance goal requirements in the FFO; or

(c) Applicants who demonstrate an innovative approach (consistent with overall NABEC program requirements) to limit barriers to market and capital access for Native American- and other eligible minority-owned businesses.

Funding Availability

MBDA anticipates that a total of approximately $611,000 will be available in FY 2007 for financial assistance awards under this competition. Specific funding levels for the North Carolina NABEC, New Mexico NABEC and Oklahoma NABEC are set forth in the below table. The anticipated start date for all awards under this competition is August 1, 2007 and the total award period is anticipated to be twelve (12) months (e.g., August 1, 2007 through July 31, 2008). The maximum Federal funding amount for each NABEC project is as follows:

Project name	August 1, 2007 through July 31, 2008		
	Estimated program cost	Federal share	Non-Federal share *
North Carolina NABEC	$188,000	$188,000	N/A
New Mexico NABEC	188,000	188,000	N/A
Oklahoma NABEC	235,000	235,000	N/A

* Encouraged, but not required.

Publication of this notice does not obligate the Department of Commerce or MBDA to award any specific cooperative agreement or to obligate all or any part of available funds.

Authority: Executive Order 11625 and 15 U.S.C. 1512.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA): 11.801, Native American Business Enterprise Centers.

Eligibility

For-profit entities (including sole-proprietorships, partnerships, and corporations), non-profit organizations, state and local government entities, American Indian Tribes, and educational institutions are eligible to operate NABECs.

Program Description

MBDA is soliciting competitive applications from organizations to operate Native American Business Enterprise Centers (formerly known as Native American Business Development Centers) (NABDC)) under its Native American Business Enterprise Center (NABEC) Program. The NABEC will operate through the use of trained professional business consultants who will assist Native American and other minority entrepreneurs through direct client engagements. Entrepreneurs eligible for assistance under the NABEC Program are Native Americans, Eskimos, African Americans, Puerto Ricans, Spanish-speaking Americans, Aleuts, Asian Pacific Americans, Asian Indians and Hasidic Jews. References throughout this notice regarding a NABEC's provision of services and assistance to Native American clients also includes the eligible non-Native American clients listed in the preceding sentence. No service may be denied to any member of the eligible groups listed above.

The NABEC Program requirements increase the impact of the project by requiring that project operators deploy standardized business assistance services to the Native American and

minority business public directly, develop a network of strategic partnerships and provide strategic business consulting within the geographic service area. These requirements will be used to generate increased results with respect to financing and contracts awarded to Native American and minority-owned firms and thus, are a key component of this program.

The NABEC Program also incorporates an entrepreneurial approach to building market stability and improving quality of services delivered. This strategy expands the reach of the NABECs by requiring project operators to develop and build upon strategic alliances with public and private sector partners, as a means of reaching out and serving Native American and minority-owned firms with rapid growth potential within the project's geographic service area. The NABEC Program leverages the full benefit of telecommunications technology, including the Internet and a variety of online computer-based resources, to dramatically increase the level of service that the NABECs provide to Native American and minority-owned firms. In addition, MBDA will establish specialized advanced programs for growth assistance to clients with the capacity to grow and expand. These programs are designed to foster growth assistance for its clients. The NABEC will also encourage collaboration and referrals of clients and non-clients that meet the requirements of these specialized programs and other MBDA sponsored networks. This will provide a comprehensive approach to serving the emerging sector of the Native American business community.

MBDA's new strategic growth initiative is focused on serving emerging Native American and minority firms capable of impacting economic growth and employment. MBDA wants to ensure that NABEC clients are receiving a consistent level of service throughout its funded network. To that end, MBDA will require NABEC consultants to attend a series of training courses designed to achieve standardized services and quality expectations.

Please refer to the FFO for this competitive solicitation for additional programmatic information.

Match Requirements

It is not required that an applicant for a NABEC award propose a non-Federal cost share contribution. An applicant may, however, propose a cost-share contribution in any of the following four means or in any combination thereof: (1) Client fees; (2) cash contributions; (3) non-cash applicant contributions; and/or (4) third party in-kind contributions. The NABEC may (but is not required to) charge client fees for services rendered. Client fees (if imposed) shall be used towards meeting cost share requirements and must be used in furtherance of the program objectives. Applicants will be awarded up to five (5) bonus points to the extent that the proposed project budget includes a non-Federal cost-share contribution, measured as a percentage of the overall project budget (see Evaluation Criteria below).

Evaluation Criteria

Applications will be evaluated and selected for funding based on the following criteria. An application must receive at least 70% of the total points available for each evaluation criterion, in order for the application to be considered for funding. The maximum number of total points for each evaluation criterion is provided below. The number of points assigned to each evaluation criterion will be determined on a competitive basis by the MBDA review panel based on the quality of the application with respect to each criterion. The maximum total of points that can be earned is 105, including a maximum of five (5) bonus points for applications proposing a non-federal cost share.

1. Applicant Capability (45 Points)

The applicant's proposal will be evaluated with respect to the applicant firm's experience and expertise in providing the work requirements listed. Specifically, the proposals will be evaluated as follows:

- Native American Community—experience in and knowledge of the Native American and minority business sector and strategies for enhancing its growth and expansion (5 points);
- Business Consulting—experience in and knowledge of business consulting of Native American and minority firms (10 points);
- Financing—experience in and knowledge of the preparation and formulation of successful financial transactions (5 points);
- Procurements and Contracting—experience in and knowledge of the public and private sector contracting opportunities for Native American and minority businesses (5 points);
- Financing Networks—resources and professional relationships within the corporate, banking and investment community that may be beneficial to Native American and minority-owned firms (5 points);
- Native American Advocacy—experience and expertise in advocating on behalf of Native American businesses, both as to specific transactions in which a Native American business seeks to engage, and as to broad market advocacy for the benefit of the Native American community at large (5 points); and
- Key Staff—assessment of the qualifications, experience and proposed role of staff who will operate the NABEC. In particular, an assessment will be made to determine whether proposed staff possesses the expertise in utilizing information systems as contemplated under the heading entitled, ''Computer Requirements'' (10 points).

2. Resources (20 Points)

The applicant's proposal will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- *Resources*—discuss those resources (not included as part of the cost-sharing arrangement) that will be used (10 points);
- *Partners*—discuss how you plan to establish and maintain the network of five (5) Strategic Partners (5 points);
- *Equipment*—discuss how you plan to accomplish the computer hardware and software requirements (5 points).

3. Techniques and Methodologies (25 Points)

The applicant's proposal will be evaluated as follows:

- *Performance Measures*—relate each performance measure to the financial, information and market resources available in the geographic service area to the applicant and how the performance goals will be met. Specific attention should be placed on the Dollar Value of Transactions. This goal represents the sum of (a) Dollar Value of Financial Transactions and (b) Dollar Value of Gross Receipts. Dollar Value of Transactions, Dollar Value of Financial Transactions and Dollar Value of Gross Receipts are defined in Section I.F. of the FFO under Performance Measures. When proposing the minimum goal under Dollar Value of Transactions, the applicant is given the flexibility to address the percentage breakdown for items (a) and (b) above within a specific range—not more than 60% and not less than 40%. The applicant should consider existing market conditions and its strategy to achieve the goal. The applicant may vary the percentage breakdown for items (a) and (b) above as long as the sum meets the required performance goal as provided in the FFO (15 points);

• *Plan of Action*—provide specific detail on how the applicant will start operations. NABECs have thirty (30) days to become fully operational after an award is made. Fully operational means that all staff are hired, all signs are up, all items of furniture and equipment are in place and operational, all necessary forms are developed (*e.g.*, client engagement letters, other standard correspondence, etc.), and the center is ready to open its doors to the public (5 points);

• *Work Requirement Execution Plan*—The applicant will be evaluated on how effectively and efficiently all staff time will be used to achieve the work requirements (5 points).

4. Proposed Budget and Supporting Budget Narrative (10 Points)

The applicant's proposal will be evaluated on the following sub-criteria:

• Reasonableness, allowability and allocability of costs. All of the proposed expenditures must be discussed and the budget line item narrative must match the proposed budget. Fringe benefits and other percentage item calculations must match the proposed budget line-item (5 points); and

• Performance Based Budget. Discuss how the budget is related to the accomplishment of the work requirements and the performance measures. Provide a budget narrative that clearly shows the connections (5 points).

Bonus for Non-Federal Cost Sharing (maximum of 5 points): Non-Federal cost sharing is not required under the NABEC program. However, applicants will be awarded bonus points to the extent that the proposed overall project budget includes non-Federal contributions, measured as a percentage of the overall project budget (i.e., Federal and non-Federal shares). Specifically, a maximum of five (5) bonus points will be awarded based on the following scale: more than 0—less than 5%—1 point; 5% or more—less than 10%—2 points; 10% or more—less than 15%—3 points; 15% or more—less than 20%—4 points; and 20% or more—5 points. The non-Federal contributions (if proposed) may consist of one or more of the following: (1) Client fees; (2) cash contributions; (3) non-cash applicant contributions; and/or (4) third party in-kind contributions, and must be adequately identified and documented in the application

Review and Selection Process

1. *Initial Screening*—Prior to the formal paneling process, each application will receive an initial screening to ensure that all required forms, signatures and documentation are present.

2. *Panel Review*—Each application will receive an independent, objective review by a panel qualified to evaluate the applications submitted. MBDA anticipates that the review panel will be made up of at least three independent reviewers who are Federal employees who will review all applications based on the above evaluation criteria. Each reviewer will evaluate and provide a score for each proposal. In order for an application to be considered for funding, it shall need to achieve 70% of the available points for each evaluation criterion. Failure to achieve the minimum required points will deem the application as unsuccessful.

3. *Final Recommendation*—The MBDA National Director makes the final recommendation to the Department of Commerce Grants Officer regarding the funding of applications, taking into account the selection criteria as outlined in this notice and the following:

A. Evaluations and rankings of the independent review panel;

B. Funding Priorities. The National Director (or his designee) reserves the right to conduct a site visit (subject to the availability of funding) to applicant organizations receiving at least 70% of the total points available for each evaluation criterion, in order to make a better assessment of the organization's capability to achieve the funding priorities for this competition; and

C. Availability of funding.

Intergovernmental Review

Applications under this program are not subject to Executive Order 12372, ''Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.''

Limitation of Liability

In no event will the Department of Commerce or MBDA be responsible for proposal preparation costs if this program is cancelled because of other Agency priorities. Publication of this announcement does not oblige the Department of Commerce or MBDA to award any specific project or to obligate any available funds.

Universal Identifier

Applicants should be aware that they will be required to provide a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering system (DUNS) number during the application process. See the June 27, 2003 **Federal Register** notice (68 FR 38402) for additional information. Organizations can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1–866–705–5711 or by accessing the Grants.gov Web site at *http://www.Grants.gov*.

Department of Commerce Pre-Award Notification Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements

The Department of Commerce Pre-Award Notification Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements contained in the **Federal Register** notice of December 30, 2004 (69 FR 78389) are applicable to this solicitation.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This document contains collection-of-information requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). The use of Standard Forms 424, 424A, 424B, SF–LLL, and CD–346 have been approved by OMB under the respective control numbers 0348–0043, 0348–0044, 0348–0040, 0348–0046, and 0605–0001. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Executive Order 12866

This notice has been determined to be not significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

Administrative Procedure Act/ Regulatory Flexibility Act

Prior notice and an opportunity for public comment are not required by the Administrative Procedure Act for rules concerning public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts (5 U.S.C. 533(a)(2)). Because notice and opportunity for comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 533 or any other law, the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C 601 *et seq.*) are inapplicable. Therefore, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required and has not been prepared.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Ronald N. Langston,

National Director, Minority Business Development Agency.

[FR Doc. E7–9096 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–21–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of closed meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that the Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award will meet Tuesday, June 5, 2007. The Judges Panel is composed of twelve members prominent in the fields of quality, innovation, and performance excellence and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the Judging process and Judging process changes for 2007; the Judges' survey of applicants; and the Judges' mentoring process. The applications under review by Judges contain trade secrets and proprietary commercial information submitted to the Government in confidence.

DATES: The meeting will convene June 5, 2007 at 9 a.m. and adjourn at 4:30 p.m. on June 5, 2007. The entire meeting will be closed.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Administration Building, Lecture Room A, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Harry Hertz, Director, National Quality Program, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, telephone number (301) 975–2361.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel, formally determined on December 27, 2005, that the meeting of the Judges Panel will be closed pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, as amended by Section 5(c) of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409. The meeting, which involves examination of Award applicant data from U.S. companies and other organizations and a discussion of this data as compared to the Award criteria in order to recommend Award recipients, may be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b(c)(4) of Title 5, United States Code, because the meetings are likely to disclose trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person which is privileged or confidential.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

James M. Turner,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. E7–9145 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Board of Overseers

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that there will be a meeting of the Board of Overseers of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award on June 6, 2007. The Board of Overseers is composed of eleven members prominent in the fields of quality, innovation, and performance excellence and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, assembled to advise the Secretary of Commerce on the conduct of the Baldrige Award. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss and review information received from the National Institute of Standards and Technology with the members of the Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. The agenda will include: Discuss the Award Eligibility Rules; Baldrige Improvement Panel's Recommendations to the Program and the Baldrige Foundation; Oral Feedback for Award Recipients; and Formation of Business School Deans' Council.

DATES: The meeting will convene June 6, 2007, at 8:30 a.m. and adjourn at 3 p.m. on June 6, 2007.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Administration Building, Lecture Room A, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899. All visitors to the National Institute of Standards and Technology site will have to pre-register to be admitted. Please submit your name, time of arrival, email address and phone number to Diane Harrison no later than Tuesday, June 5, 2007, and she will provide you with instructions for admittance. Ms. Harrison's e-mail address is *diane.harrison@nist.gov* and her phone number is (301) 975–2361.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Harry Hertz, Director, National Quality Program, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, telephone number (301) 975–2361.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

James M. Turner,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. E7–9143 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 031507B]

Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement; Seismic Surveys in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On April 6, 2007, notice was published in the Federal Register that NMFS and the Minerals Management Service had released for public comment a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS) for Seismic Surveys in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska. Also, the times, dates, and locations for public hearings in order to receive comments from the public on the Draft PEIS were provided. Based on verbal requests during the public hearings and two written requests, the comment period on this document has been extended.

DATES: Written comments must be postmarked by June 29, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the Draft PEIS should be addressed to Mr. P. Michael Payne, Chief of the Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3225. The mailbox address for providing email comments is *PR1.ALASKAEIS@noaa.gov*. Comments sent via e-mail, including all attachments, must not exceed a 10-megabyte file size.

A copy of the Draft PEIS may be obtained by writing to this address or by telephoning the contact listed here and is also available at: *http://www.mms.gov/alaska/*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kenneth R. Hollingshead, (301)713–2289, ext 128.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Additional information on the content of the Draft PEIS can be found in the notice of availability (72 FR 17117, April 6, 2007).

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Wanda L. Cain,

Acting Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E7–9093 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 07–18]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Department of Defense, Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. B. English, DSCA/DBO/CFM, (703) 601–3740.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 07–18 with attached transmittal and policy justification.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-2800

In reply refer to:
I-07/003384

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6501

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 07-18, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letters(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Turkey for defense articles and services estimated to cost $71 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of this proposed sale.

You will also find attached a certification as required by Section 620C(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that this action is consistent with the principles set forth in subsection 620C(b) of that Act as codified in section 2373 of title 22, United States Code.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY B. KOHLER
LIEUTENANT GENERAL, USAF
DIRECTOR

Enclosures:
1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification
3. Sensitivity of Technology
4. Section 620C(d)

Transmittal No. 07-18

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Turkey

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment*	$55 million
Other	$16 million
TOTAL	$71 million

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: 105 AIM-9X All-Up-Round SIDEWINDER Missiles, 78 LAU-129 launchers, 22 Captive Air Training Missiles, missile containers, missile modifications, test sets and support equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical data, maintenance, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government (USG) and contractor representatives, contractor engineering and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (AAI)

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS case AHX - $49 million - 20Sep05

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: none

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex attached

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress:

* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Turkey - AIM-9X All-Up-Round SIDEWINDER Missiles

The Government of Turkey has requested a possible sale of 105 AIM-9X All-Up-Round SIDEWINDER Missiles, 78 LAU-129 launchers, 22 Captive Air Training Missiles, missile containers, missile modifications, test sets and support equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical data, maintenance, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government (USG) and contractor representatives, contractor engineering and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is $71 million.

Turkey is a political and economic power in Europe and the eastern Mediterranean, and a partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability in those regions. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our Turkish North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability that will contribute to an acceptable military balance in the area. This proposed sale is consistent with those objectives.

The proposed sale of the AIM-9X SIDEWINDER missiles is part of Turkey's modernization effort and will enhance its current air-to-air intercept capability. Sales of the AIM-9X have recently been approved for other customers within the region. The missiles will be provided in accordance with, and subject to the limitation on use and transfer provided under the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, and as embodied in the Letter of Offer and Acceptance.

This proposed sale will not adversely affect either the military balance in the region or U.S. efforts to encourage a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Systems Corporation, Tucson, Arizona. Offset agreements associated with this proposed sale are expected, but at this time the specific offset agreements are undetermined and will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and contractors.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Turkey.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

Transmittal No. 07-18

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex
Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-9X represents a substantial increase in missile acquisition and kinematics performance over previous AIM-9 variants. The missile includes a high off bore-sight seeker, enhanced countermeasure rejection capability, low drag/high angle of attack airframe and the ability to integrate the Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System. The software algorithms are the most sensitive portions of the AIM-9X missile. The software continues to be modified during the testing phase in order to improve its counter-countermeasures capabilities. No software source code or algorithms will be released. Sensitive and/or classified (up to Secret) elements of the AIM-9X missiles include equipment/hardware, and software, and classified portions of operational performance. Maintenance training documentation is unclassified, including missile sectionalization training.

2. The external view of the AIM-9X Sidewinder Missile is Unclassified and is not sensitive. The seeker/guidance and control section and the target detector are Confidential and contain sensitive state-of-the-art technology. Specifically, the infrared seeker sensitivity is a significant improvement over the previous AIM-9 variants. Manuals and technical documents for the AIM-9X that support the ability to integrate with aircraft sensors are classified up to Secret. Performance and operating logic of the counter-countermeasures circuits are Secret. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified to protect vulnerabilities, design and performance parameters, and similar critical information.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon systems effectiveness or could be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

UNCLASSIFIED

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO § 620C(d) OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED

Pursuant to Section 620C(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the Act), Executive Order 12163, State Department Delegation of Authority No. 293-1, and a State Department Delegation of Authority signed March 12, 2007, I hereby certify that the furnishing to Turkey of 105 AIM-9X All-Up-Round SIDEWINDER missiles, 78 LAU-129 launchers, 22 Captive Air Training Missiles, missile containers, missile modifications, test sets and support equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical data, maintenance, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government (USG) and contractor representatives, contractor engineering and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics support is consistent with the principles contained in Section 620C(b) of the Act.

This certification will be made part of the notification to Congress under Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, regarding the proposed sale of the above-named articles and services and is based on the justification accompanying said notification, of which said justification constitutes a full explanation.

John C. Rood
Assistant Secretary of State
for International Security and
Nonproliferation

[FR Doc. 07–2330 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–06–C

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 07–20]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Department of Defense, Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. B. English, DSCA/DBO/CFM, (703) 601–3740.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 07–20 with attached transmittal and policy justification.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-2800

In reply refer to:
I-07/003476

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6501

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 07-20, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Iraq for defense articles and services estimated to cost $508 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Millies

Deputy Director

Enclosures:
1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification

Same ltr to:

House	Senate
Committee on Foreign Affairs	Committee on Foreign Relations
Committee on Armed Services	Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations	Committee on Appropriations

Transmittal No. 07-20

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Iraq

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment*	$255 million
Other	$253 million
TOTAL	$508 million

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

600,000	12 Gauge 00 Buckshot	80,000	C4 1 ¼ pound
16,000,000	9mm Ball	4,200,000	Feet Detonating Cord
100,000,000	M855 5.56 Ball	110,000	Feet Time Fuze
40,000,000	5.56mm Tracer	20,000	Time Fuze Igniter
50,000,000	5.56mm Blank	20,000	Non-Electric Blasting Caps
36,000,000	5.56mm 4 Ball/1 Tracer	112,500	M14 Non-Electric Blasting Caps
30,000,000	7.62mm 4 Ball/1 Tracer	20,000	Non-Electric Blasting Caps
10,000,000	M118 7.62 X 51mm Ball	180.00	Flash Bang Grenade
100,000,000	7.62mm X 39mm Ball	20,000	HC Smoke Grenade
20,000,000	.50 Caliber 4 Ball/1 Tracer	20,000	Yellow Smoke Grenade
170,000	40mm HEDP Grenade		

Also included are: diesel (75M gallons) fuel, MOGAS (56.4M gallons), and JP-8 (2.9M gallons); logistics support services/equipment spare and repair parts; support equipment, publications and documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (ABK)

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: none

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: none

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: none

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress:

* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Iraq - Various Small Arms Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Consumables

The Government of Iraq has requested a possible sale of the following:

600,000	12 Gauge 00 Buckshot	80,000	C4 1 ¼ pound
16,000,000	9mm Ball	4,200,000	Feet Detonating Cord
100,000,000	M855 5.56 Ball	110,000	Feet Time Fuze
40,000,000	5.56mm Tracer	20,000	Time Fuze Igniter
50,000,000	5.56mm Blank	20,000	Non-Electric Blasting Caps
36,000,000	5.56mm 4 Ball/1 Tracer	112,500	M14 Non-Electric Blasting Caps
30,000,000	7.62mm 4 Ball/1 Tracer	20,000	Non-Electric Blasting Caps
10,000,000	M118 7.62 X 51mm Ball	180,00	Flash Bang Grenade
100,000,000	7.62mm X 39mm Ball	20,000	HC Smoke Grenade
20,000,000	.50 Caliber 4 Ball/1 Tracer	20,000	Yellow Smoke Grenada
170,000	40mm HEDP Grenade		

Also included are: diesel (75M gallons) fuel, MOGAS (56.4M gallons), and JP-8 (2.9M gallons); logistics support services/equipment spare and repair parts; support equipment, publications and documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is $508 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. This proposed sale directly supports the Iraqi government and serves the interests of the Iraqi people and the U.S., as well as offering hope for a more stable and peaceful Middle East.

The sale of the ammunition for small arms, grenades, pyrotechnics, explosives for demolition, and other consumables and support will enhance the ability of the Iraqi forces to sustain themselves in their efforts to bring stability to the country and prevent overflow of unrest into neighboring countries.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The contractors are unknown at this time. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government and contractor representatives to Iraq.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

[FR Doc. 07–2331 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001–01–C

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000–0075]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Information Collection; Government Property

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments regarding a revision to an existing OMB clearance (9000–0075).

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to revise a currently approved information collection requirement concerning Government Property. This OMB clearance expires on February 28, 2010.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Submit comments on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, including suggestions for reducing this burden to the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (VIR), 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4035, Washington, DC 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeritta Parnell, Contract Policy Division, GSA (202) 501–4082.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

Property, as used in Part 45, means all property, both real and personal. Government property includes both Government-furnished property and contractor-acquired property.

Contractors are required to manage (control, use, preserve, protect, repair, and maintain) Government property in its possession consistent with voluntary consensus standards or in the absence of such standards, industry leading practices and standards for property management because the contractor is responsible and accountable for all Government property under the provisions of the contract including property located with subcontractors.

Contractors shall develop property management plans andsystems to obtain best value.

This clearance covers the following requirements:

(a) FAR 45.606–1 requires a contractor to submit inventory schedules.

(b) FAR 45.606–3(a) requires a contractor to correct and resubmit inventory schedules as necessary.

(c) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(ii) requires contractors to receive, record, identify and manage Government property.

(d) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(iii) requires contractors to create and maintain records of all Government property accountable to the contract.

(e) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(iv) requires contractors to periodically perform, record, and report physical inventories during contract performance.

(f) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(vi) requires contractors to have a process to create and provide reports.

(g) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(viii) requires contractors to promptly disclose and report Government Property in its possession that is excess to contract performance.

(h) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(ix) requires contractors to disclose and report to the Property Administrator the need for replacement and/or capital rehabilitation.

(i) FAR 52.245–1(f)(1)(x) requires contractors to perform and report to the Property Administrator contract property closeout.

(j) FAR 52.245–1(f)(2) requires contractors to establish and maintain source data, particularly in the areas of recognition of acquisitions and dispositions of material and equipment.

(k) FAR 52.245–1(j)(4) requires contractors to submit inventory disposal schedules to the Plant Clearance Officer.

(l) FAR 52.245–9(d) requires a contractor to identify the property for which rental is requested.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Number of Respondents: 15,100.

Responses per Respondent: 896.71.

Total Responses: 13,540,450.

Average Burden Hours Per Response: .46.

Total Burden Hours: 6,226,350.

The total burden hours have changed under this OMB clearance 9000–0075 to reflect the incorporation of hours currently associated with OMB clearance 9000–0075(FAR Case 2004–025).

Obtaining Copies of Proposals: Requesters may obtain a copy ofthe information collection documents from the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (VIR), Room 4035, 1800 F Street,NW, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501–4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000–0075, Government Property, in all correspondence.

Dated: May 2, 2007.

Al Matera,

Acting Director, Contract Policy Division

[FR Doc. 07–2254 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6820–EP–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Scientific Advisory Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice is published in accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463). The topic of the meeting on June 13–14, 2007 are to review new start and continuing research and development projects requesting Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program funds in excess of $1M. This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Scientific Advisory Board at the time and in the manner permitted by the Board.

DATES: June 13, 2007 from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and June 14 8:30 a.m. to 12:40 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Century House Clarion Hotel, 997 New Loudon Road, Latham, NY 12110.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Misa Jensen, SERDP Program Office, 901 North Stuart Street, Suite 303, Arlington, VA or by telephone at (703) 696–2126.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 07–2329 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Department of Defense Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs); DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix, as amended), the Sunshine in the Government Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended) and 41 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 102–3.140 through 160, the Department of Defense announces the following committee meeting:

Name of Committee: Department of Defense Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care, a duly established subcommittee of the Defense Health Board.

Date of Meeting: May 22, 2007.

Time of Meeting: 8:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place of Meeting: National Transportation Safety Board Conference Center, 429 L'Enfant Plaza, Washington, DC 20594.

Purpose of Meeting: To obtain, review, and evaluate information related to the Task Force's congressionally-directed mission to examine matters relating to the future of military health care. The Task Force members will receive briefings on topics related to the delivery of military health care during the public meeting.

Agenda: Discussion topic will be Disease Management issues related to the military healthcare system.

Prior to the public meeting the Task Force will conduct a Preparatory Work Meeting from 8 a.m.–8:25 a.m. to solely analyze relevant issues and facts in preparation for the Task Force's next public meeting. In addition, the Task Force, following its public meeting, will conduct an additional Preparatory Work Meeting from 12:10 p.m. to 2 p.m. to analyze relevant issues and facts in preparation for the Task Force's next public meeting. Both Preparatory Meetings will be held at the National Transportation Safety Board Conference Center, and pursuant to 41 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 102–3.160(a), both Preparatory Work Meetings are closed to the public.

Additional information and meeting registration is available online at the Task Force Web site: *www.DoDfuturehealthcare.net*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Colonel Christine Bader, Executive Secretary, Department of Defense Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care, TMA/Code: DHS, Five Skyline Place, Suite 810, 5111 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041–3206, (703) 681–3279, ext. 109 (*christine.bader@ha.osd.mil*).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Open sessions of the meeting will be limited by space accommodations. Any interested person may attend; however, seating is limited to the space available at the National Transportation Safety Board Conference Center. Individuals or organizations wishing to submit written comments for consideration by the Task Force should provide their comments in an electronic (PDF Format) document through the Task Force Web site (*http://www.DoDfuturehealthcare.net*) at the ''Contact Us'' page, no later than five (5) business days prior to the scheduled meeting.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 07–2361 Filed 5–9–07; 11:27 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Availability of a Tiered Final Environmental Impact Statement Containing a Draft Air Quality General Conformity Determination for the Proposed Construction of a Dredged Material Containment Facility in the Patapsco River, at Masonville, Baltimore City, MD

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Baltimore District, has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the proposed construction of a dredged material containment facility (DMCF) by the Maryland Port Administration (MPA). This FEIS was prepared as part of the submission of MPA's application for a Department of the Army permit to construct the facility in the Patapsco River, Baltimore City, MD. This application will be evaluated pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The preferred alternative is for the construction of a stone, sand, and cofferdam structure that would impact approximately 131 acres of waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands. The structure would be initially constructed to 10 feet above the mean lower low water (MLLW) elevation, with a future temporary elevation to 42 feet above MLLW, and an ultimate elevation of 36 feet above MLLW. The project would also include mechanical dredging of approximately 1.5 million cubic yards of overburden material within the footprint of the proposed disposal site, and the placement of this material at the Hart Miller Island disposal site, Baltimore County, MD. On-site (Masonville borrow) and offsite borrow material (Seagirt borrow material and upland borrow) would be used for the construction of the containment facility. The Seagirt borrow material would come from the Seagirt Marine Terminal Access Channel deepening and widening project. The Draft EIS was advertised in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2006 (71 FR 29128). A supplement to the Draft EIS was advertised in the **Federal Register** on June 30, 2006 (71 FR 37545). The need to prepare a Supplement was due to the applicant's proposal to change the source of borrow material for the proposed construction of the preferred alternative to include the use of suitable material dredged from the Seagirt Marine Terminal Access Channels. The FEIS evaluates the construction of a DMCF with a footprint of 141 acres, which includes 131 acres of tidal open water and wetlands. The DMCF would be constructed to an initial height of 10 feet above MLLW and then raised to a height of 42 feet above MLLW before being graded to a final height of 36 feet MLLW, which would be the same height as the adjacent land. A detailed description of the proposed project and effects to the human environment are discussed in the FEIS for the Masonville DMCF. The FEIS outlines measures the applicant may implement to address impacts to air quality resulting from activities described in the permit application.

ADDRESSES: Please send written comments to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Mr. Jon Romeo, CENAB–OP–RMN, P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, MD 21203–1715. You may submit electronic comments to

jon.romeo@usace.army.mil. Your comments must be contained in the body of your message; please do not send attached filed. Please include your name and address in your message.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT: Mr. Jon Romeo, (410) 962–6079.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FEIS integrates analyses and consultation required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, Section 401 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. All appropriate documentation (i.e., Section 7 and Section 106 coordination letters and public and agency comments) have been obtained and are included as part of the FEIS. In compliance with the Clean Air Act, a Draft Air Quality General Conformity Determination has been completed and is available in the FEIS for public comment. The USACE has preliminarily determined that the General Conformity Analysis prepared for the proposed Masonville Dredged Material Containment Facility (DMCF) dated November 17, 2006, with the compensation proposed, conforms to the General Conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act. A final determination will be made no sooner than thirty (30) days from the date of this notice. the decision on whether or not to issue a Department of the Army permit for this project will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact, including cumulative impacts, of the proposed activity on the public interest. That decision will reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. The benefit, which may reasonably be expected to accrue from the proposal, will be balanced against it reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors that may be relevant to the proposal are considered as part of the evaluation process. Factors relevant to the proposed project include: Conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water and air quality, hazardous, toxic, and radioactive substances, threatened and endangered species, regional geology energy needs, food and fiber production, safety, environmental justice, cumulative impacts and the general needs and welfare of the public.

Vance G. Hobbs,

Chief, Maryland Section Northern.

[FR Doc. 07–2338 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–41–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Meeting of the U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of partially closed meeting.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors will meet to make such inquiry, as the Board shall deem necessary into the state of morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and academic methods of the Naval Academy. The meeting will include discussions of personnel issues at the Naval Academy, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. The executive session of this meeting will be closed to the public.

DATES: The open session of the meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, from 8 a.m. to 11:10 a.m. The closed Executive Session will be held from 11:10 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Major Craig C. Clemans, Executive Secretary to the Board of Visitors, Office of the Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402–5000, 410–293–1503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice of meeting is provided per the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2). The executive session of the meeting will consist of discussions of personnel issues at the Naval Academy and internal Board of Visitors matters. The proposed closed session from 1030–1215 will include a discussion of new and pending courts-martial and state criminal proceedings involving the Midshipmen attending the Naval Academy to include an update on the pending/ongoing sexual assault cases, rape cases, etc. The proposed closed session from 1030–1215 will include a discussion of new and pending administrative/minor disciplinary infractions and nonjudicial punishments involving the Midshipmen attending the Naval Academy to include but not limited to individual honor/conduct violations within the Brigade. Discussion of such information cannot be adequately segregated from other topics, which precludes opening the executive session of this meeting to the public. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy has determined in writing that the meeting shall be partially closed to the public because it will be concerned with matters listed in section 552b(c), (5), (6), (7) and of title 5, United States Code.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

L.R. Almand,

Office of the Judge Advocate General, Administrative Law Division, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9085 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before July 10, 2007.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6)

Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Angela C. Arrington,

IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.

Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Annual Mandatory Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data for ED*Facts.*

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 59.

Burden Hours: 105,754.

Abstract: ED*Facts* is in the implementation phase of a multiple year effort to consolidate the collection of education information about States, Districts, and Schools in a way that improves data quality and reduces paperwork burden for all of the national education partners. To minimize the burden on the data providers, EDEN seeks the transfer of the proposed data as soon as it has been processed for State, District, and School use. These data will then be stored in ED*Facts* and accessed by federal education program managers and analysts as needed to make program management decisions. This process will eliminate redundant data collections while providing for the timeliness of data submission and use.

Additional Information: The Department of Education (ED) is specifically requesting the data providers in each the State Education Agency (SEA) to review the proposed data elements to determine which of these data can be provided for the upcoming school year and which data would be available in later years and which data, if any, is never expected to be available from the SEA. If information for a data group is not available, please provide information beyond the fact that it is not available. Are there specific impediments to providing this data that you can describe? Is the definition for the data group unclear or ambiguous? Do the requested permitted values align with the way your state collects the data? This is very important information because ED intends to make the collection of these data mandatory. ED also seeks to know if the SEA data definitions are consistent and compatible with the EDEN definitions and accurately reflect the way data is stored and used for education by the States, Districts, and Schools. The answers to these questions by the data providers will influence the timing and content of the final EDEN proposal for the collection of this elementary and secondary data.

Additional Information for State Data Providers: In addition to overall public comments, ED would also like state education data providers to respond to a number of specific questions that were developed during the recent data definition cycle.

(1) Data Groups—An underlying purpose of the ED*Facts* Data Set is to inventory the data collected by ED. That inventory is organized into data groups and categories. In general, each table data group is its own file. Three data groups (Title I SWP/TAS Participation Tables ID 548, N or D Academic Outcomes Table (LEAs) ID 629, and N or D Academic Outcomes Table (State agencies) ID 628) were split so that the data groups would meet the definition of ''a specific aggregation (i.e. group) of related data that is stored in ED*Facts* to satisfy the specific information need of one or more ED program office.'' Are there any other data groups that should be split? Are there any data groups that should be combined?

(2) Categories—Data on students is collected by categories (characterizations used to aggregate data e.g. race/ethnicity, sex, grade level). In some cases, the data by these characterizations isn't required on all students. For example, data on the results of NCLB assessments is required to be aggregated by students with a disability status (IDEA) and by students who have been assessed as limited English proficient. Data is not required by statute to be aggregated by either students without a disability status (IDEA) or students who have not been assessed as limited English proficient. However, that data is useful to the Department for both data quality and analysis. There are times when data is required to be aggregated for all students. For example, data on the provision of educational services during expulsion is required by statute to be aggregated for both students with a disability status (IDEA) and without a disability status (IDEA). What is the burden for the SEA when aggregating data for only those students with the characteristics in comparison to aggregating for both students with the characteristic and without it for the following characteristics: Disability status (IDEA), assessed for limited English proficiency, homeless status, homeless served under McKinney-Vento status, economically disadvantaged status, and migrant status?

(3) Status Files—The status files contain the non-table data groups. The non-table data groups included in the NCLB Start of School Year File (N/X101) are:

- District Totals, ID # 460
- Improvement Status—LEA, ID #662
- Improvement Status—School, ID #34
- Integrated Technology Status, ID #524
- Persistently Dangerous Status, ID #36
- School Poverty Percentage, ID #31
- School Totals, ID #454
- Shared Time Status, ID #573
- Title I School Status, ID #22
- Magnet Status, ID #665
- Classroom Teachers (FTE), ID #644

The non-table data groups included in the NCLB End of School Year File (N/X102) are:

- Economically Disadvantaged Students, ID #56
- Combined MEP Funds Status Table, ID #514
- GFSA Reporting Status, ID #603
- REAP Alternative Funding Indicator, ID #614
- Average Daily Attendance, ID #595
- Supplemental Services—Applied to Receive Services, ID #575
- Supplemental Services—Eligible to Receive Services, ID #578
- Supplemental Services—Received Services, ID #546
- Supplemental Services—Funds Spent, ID #651
- School Choice—Funds Spent, ID #652
- Truants, ID #664
- MEP Students Eligible Regular School Year, ID #110

Are these status files properly organized to ensure the timely submission of data and reduce burden? If not, how should the non-table data groups be organized?

(4) Migrant Education Program—The ED*Facts* data set did not completely align with the collection of data for the Migrant Education Program (MEP), Title I, Part C through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and Migrant Child Count Form. The data groups

collecting data on the MEP Program have been revised accordingly. The chart below displays the relationship among the data groups for students.

Type of MEP student	Type of MEP count		
	12-month	Regular school year	Summer/ intersession
Eligible	634 (SEA)	110 (school)	
Served (no Schoolwide)		636 (SEA)	637 (SEA)
Eligible and Served			635 (SEA)

Are the revised definitions and comments sufficient to describe the data that should be collected?

(5) School Operational Status—The data group School Operational Status (ID 531) has the following permitted values: Open, closed, new, added, changed agency, inactive, future school, reopened. Is a new permitted value needed for restructured under NCLB? Do SEAs create new schools when a school is restructured under NCLB? Are new state school identification numbers assigned when a school is restructured under NCLB? Do schools that are restructured under NCLB met the definition of open which is ''no significant change in instructional levels and programs?''

(6) GEPA—As discussed in Attachment B–4, the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), Section 424 mandates reporting on the distribution of federal education funds to school districts and other entities, such as libraries, colleges and universities, state agencies, individual schools and private recipients. In the past, the data for the GEPA report has been collected through a separate collection. For the GEPA report on FYs 2006 and 2007, the data will be obtained for state administered grants to LEAs through ED*Facts.* How will this change impact SEAs? What must ED do to make this transition successful? How should ED collect data on state administered grants that do not go to SEAs or LEAs?

(7) Reading NCLB State Assessments—ED*Facts* collects data on participation and results of NCLB state assessments. Data is collected on mathematics, reading, and science. The data on participation is collected in one file (N/X081) using permitted values to differentiate between the academic subjects. The data on the results of NCLB state assessments is collected in separate files. For mathematics and science, the participation file has one permitted value for each and both have one file to collect the results of state assessments. For reading, the participation file has three permitted values and the results of state assessments are collected using three files. The three values and files are entitled reading, reading/language arts, and language arts. Can the reading participation and results of state assessments be collected using only one permitted value (reading) and one file (reading)?

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from *http://edicsweb.ed.gov,* by selecting the ''Browse Pending Collections'' link and by clicking on link number 3334. When you access the information collection, click on ''Download Attachments'' to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Potomac Center, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20202–4700. Requests may also be electronically mailed to *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov* or faxed to 202–245–6623. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov.* Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

[FR Doc. 07–2354 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4001–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of the annual updates to the Income Contingent Repayment (ICR) plan formula for 2007.

SUMMARY: The Secretary announces the annual updates to the ICR plan formula for 2007. Under the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program, borrowers may choose to repay their student loans (Direct Subsidized Loans, Direct Unsubsidized Loans, and Direct Consolidation Loans) under the ICR plan, which bases the repayment amount on the borrower's income, family size, loan amount, and interest rate. Each year, we adjust the formula for calculating a borrower's payment to reflect changes due to inflation. This notice contains the adjusted income percentage factors for 2007, examples of how the calculation of the monthly ICR amount is performed, a constant multiplier chart for use in performing the calculations, and charts showing sample repayment amounts based on the adjusted ICR plan formula. The adjustments for the ICR plan formula contained in this notice are effective from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Watson, U.S. Department of Education, room 114I2, UCP, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202–5400. Telephone: (202) 219–7037.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (*e.g.,* Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Direct Loan Program borrowers may choose to repay their Direct Subsidized Loans, Direct Unsubsidized Loans, and Direct Consolidation Loans under the ICR plan. The attachments to this notice provide updates to examples of how the calculation of the monthly ICR amount is performed, the updated income percentage factors, a constant multiplier chart for use in calculating the monthly ICR amount, and charts showing sample repayment amounts for single and married borrowers.

We have updated the income percentage factors to reflect changes based on inflation. We have revised the table of income percentage factors by changing the dollar amounts of the incomes shown by a percentage equal to the estimated percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers from December 2006 to December 2007. Further, we provide

examples of monthly repayment amount calculations and two charts that show sample repayment amounts for single and married or head-of-household borrowers at various income and debt levels based on the updated income percentage factors.

The updated income percentage factors, at any given income, may cause a borrower's payments to be slightly lower than they were in prior years. This updated amount more accurately reflects the impact of inflation on a borrower's current ability to repay.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: *http://www.ed.gov/news/federegister.*

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free at 1–888–293–6498; or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html.*

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1087 *et seq.*

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Theresa S. Shaw,

Chief Operating Officer, Federal Student Aid.

Attachment—Examples of the Calculations of Monthly Repayment Amounts

Example 1. This example assumes you are a single borrower with $15,000 in Direct Subsidized and/or Unsubsidized Loans, the interest rate being charged is 6.80 percent, and you have an adjusted gross income (AGI) of $36,251. (The 6.80 percent interest rate used in this example is a fixed interest rate that is charged on all Direct Subsidized Loans and Direct Unsubsidized Loans first disbursed on or after July 1, 2006. Different interest rates apply to Direct Subsidized Loans and Direct Unsubsidized Loans first disbursed before July 1, 2006, and to Direct PLUS Loans and Direct Consolidation Loans. Your actual interest rate may be less than or greater than 6.80 percent.)

Step 1: Determine your annual payments based on what you would pay over 12 years using standard amortization. To do this, multiply your loan balance by the constant multiplier for an interest rate of 6.80 percent (0.122130). The constant multiplier is a factor used to calculate amortized payments at a given interest rate over a fixed period of time. You can view the constant multiplier chart at the end of this notice to determine the constant multiplier that you should use for the interest rate on your loan. If your exact interest rate is not listed, use the next highest rate for estimation purposes.

- $0.122130 \times \$15{,}000 = \$1{,}831.95$

Step 2: Multiply the result of Step 1 by the income percentage factor shown in the income percentage factors table that corresponds to your income and then divide the result by 100 (if your income is not listed in the income percentage factors table, calculate the applicable income percentage factor by following the instructions under the *Interpolation* heading later in this notice):

- $88.77 \times \$1{,}831.95 \div 100 = \$1{,}626.22$

Step 3: Determine 20 percent of your discretionary income (your discretionary income is your AGI minus the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Poverty Guideline amount for your family size). Because you are a single borrower, subtract the poverty level for a family of one, as published in the **Federal Register** on January 24, 2007 (72 FR 3147), from your AGI and multiply the result by 20 percent:

- $\$36{,}251 - \$10{,}210 = \$26{,}041$
- $\$26{,}041 \times 0.20 = \$5{,}208.20$

Step 4: Compare the amount from Step 2 with the amount from Step 3. The lower of the two will be your annual payment amount. In this example, you will be paying the amount calculated under Step 2. To determine your monthly repayment amount, divide the annual amount by 12.

- $\$1{,}626.22 \div 12 = \$135.52$

Example 2. In this example, you are married. You and your spouse have a combined AGI of $68,504 and are repaying your loans jointly under the ICR plan. You have no children. You have a Direct Loan balance of $10,000, and your spouse has a Direct Loan balance of $15,000. Your interest rate is 6.80 percent.

Step 1: Add your and your spouse's Direct Loan balances together to determine your aggregate loan balance:

- $\$10{,}000 + \$15{,}000 = \$25{,}000$

Step 2: Determine the annual payment based on what you would pay over 12 years using standard amortization. To do this, multiply your loan balance by the constant multiplier for 6.80 percent interest (0.122130). You can view the constant multiplier chart at the end of this notice to determine the constant multiplier that you should use for the interest rate on your loan. If your exact interest rate is not listed, use the next highest rate for estimation purposes.

- $0.122130 \times \$25{,}000 = \$3{,}053.25$

Step 3: Multiply the result of Step 2 by the income percentage factor shown in the income percentage factors table that corresponds to your and your spouse's income and then divide the result by 100 (if your and your spouse's aggregate income is not listed in the income percentage factors table, calculate the applicable income percentage factor by following the instructions under the *Interpolation* heading later in this notice):

- $109.40 \times \$3{,}053.25 \div 100 = \$3{,}340.26$

Step 4: Determine 20 percent of your discretionary income. To do this, subtract the poverty level for a family of two, as published in the **Federal Register** on January 24, 2007 (72 FR 3147), from your combined AGI and multiply the result by 20 percent:

- $\$68{,}504 - \$13{,}690 = \$54{,}814.00$
- $\$54{,}814.00 \times 0.20 = \$10{,}962.80$

Step 5: Compare the amount from Step 3 with the amount from Step 4. The lower of the two will be your annual payment amount. You and your spouse will pay the amount calculated under Step 3. To determine your monthly repayment amount, divide the annual amount by 12.

- $\$3{,}340.26 \div 12 = \$278.36$

Example 3. This example assumes you are a single borrower with $15,000 in Direct Subsidized and/or Unsubsidized Loans, the interest rate being charged is 8.25 percent, and you have an AGI of $28,860. (The 8.25 percent interest rate used in this example is the maximum interest rate that may be charged for all Direct Subsidized Loans and Direct Unsubsidized Loans that were first disbursed before July 1, 2006. Different interest rates apply to Direct Subsidized Loans and Direct Unsubsidized Loans first disbursed on or after July 1, 2006, and to Direct PLUS Loans and Direct Consolidation Loans. Your actual interest rate may be lower.)

Step 1: Determine your annual payments based on what you would pay over 12 years using standard amortization. To do this, multiply your loan balance by the constant multiplier for 8.25 percent interest (0.131545). The constant multiplier is a factor used to calculate amortized payments at a given interest rate over a fixed period of time. You can view the constant multiplier chart at the end of this notice to determine the constant multiplier that you should use for the interest rate on your loan. If your exact interest rate is not listed, use the next highest rate for estimation purposes.

- $0.131545 \times \$15{,}000 = \$1{,}973.18$

Step 2: Multiply the result of Step 1 by the income percentage factor shown in the income percentage factors table that corresponds to your income and then divide the result by 100 (if your income is not listed in the income percentage factors table, calculate the applicable income percentage factor by following the instructions under the *Interpolation* heading later in this notice):

- $80.33 \times \$1{,}973.18 \div 100 = \$1{,}585.06$

Step 3: Determine 20 percent of your discretionary income (your discretionary income is your AGI minus the HHS Poverty Guideline amount for your family size). Because you are a single borrower, subtract the poverty level for a family of one, as published in the **Federal Register** on January 24, 2007 (72 FR 3147), from your AGI and multiply the result by 20 percent:

- $\$28{,}860 - \$10{,}210 = \$18{,}650$
- $\$18{,}650 \times 0.20 = \$3{,}730$

Step 4: Compare the amount from Step 2 with the amount from Step 3. The lower of the two will be your annual payment amount. In this example, you will be paying the amount calculated under Step 2. To

determine your monthly repayment amount, divide the annual amount by 12.

- $1,585.06 ÷ 12 = $132.09

Example 4. In this example, you are married. You and your spouse have a combined AGI of $54,680 and are repaying your loans jointly under the ICR plan. You have no children. You have a Direct Loan balance of $10,000, and your spouse has a Direct Loan balance of $15,000. Your interest rate is 8.25 percent.

Step 1: Add your and your spouse's Direct Loan balances together to determine your aggregate loan balance:

- $10,000 + $15,000 = $25,000

Step 2: Determine the annual payment based on what you would pay over 12 years using standard amortization. To do this, multiply your aggregate loan balance by the constant multiplier for 8.25 percent interest (0.131545). You can view the constant multiplier chart at the end of this notice to determine the constant multiplier that you should use for the interest rate on your loan. If your exact interest rate is not listed, use the next highest rate for estimation purposes.

- 0.131545 × $25,000 = $3,288.63

Step 3: Multiply the result of Step 2 by the income percentage factor shown in the income percentage factors table that corresponds to your and your spouse's income and then divide the result by 100 (if your and your spouse's aggregate income is not listed in the income percentage factors table, calculate the applicable income percentage factor by following the instructions under the *Interpolation* heading later in this notice):

- 100.00 × $3,288.63 ÷ 100 = $3,288.63

Step 4: Determine 20 percent of your discretionary income. To do this, subtract the poverty level for a family of two, as published in the **Federal Register** on January 24, 2007 (72 FR 3147), from your combined AGI and multiply the result by 20 percent:

- $54,680 − $13,690 = $40,990
- $40,990 × 0.20 = $8,198

Step 5: Compare the amount from Step 3 with the amount from Step 4. The lower of the two will be your annual payment amount. You and your spouse will pay the amount calculated under Step 3. To determine your monthly repayment amount, divide the annual amount by 12.

- $3,288.63 ÷ 12 = $274.05

Interpolation: If your income does not appear on the income percentage factor table, you will have to calculate the income percentage factor through interpolation. For example, assume you are single and your income is $30,000.

Step 1: Find the closest income listed that is less than your income of $30,000 and the closest income listed that is greater than your income of $30,000.

Step 2: Subtract the lower amount from the higher amount (for this discussion, we will call the result the ''income interval''):

- $36,251 − $28,860 = $7,391

Step 3: Determine the difference between the two income percentage factors that are given for these incomes (for this discussion, we will call the result the ''income percentage factor interval''):

- 88.77% − 80.33% = 8.44%

Step 4: Subtract from your income the closest income shown on the chart that is less than your income of $30,000:

- $30,000 − $28,860 = $1,140

Step 5: Divide the result of Step 4 by the income interval determined in Step 2:

- $1,140 ÷ $7,391= 0.1542

Step 6: Multiply the result of Step 5 by the income percentage factor interval:

- 8.44% × 0.1542 = 1.301%

Step 7: Add the result of Step 6 to the lower of the two income percentage factors used in Step 3 to calculate the income percentage factor interval for $30,000 in income:

- 1.301% + 80.33% = 81.63% (rounded to the nearest hundredth)

The result is the income percentage factor that will be used to calculate the monthly repayment amount under the ICR plan.

INCOME PERCENTAGE FACTORS FOR 2006

[Based on annual income]

Single		Married/head of household	
Income	% factor	Income	% factor
9,477	55.00	9,477	50.52
13,040	57.79	14,953	56.68
16,779	60.57	17,820	59.56
20,603	66.23	23,296	67.79
24,255	71.89	28,860	75.22
28,860	80.33	36,251	87.61
36,251	88.77	45,463	100.00
45,464	100.00	54,680	100.00
54,680	100.00	68,504	109.40
65,719	111.80	91,538	125.00
84,150	123.50	123,789	140.60
119,184	141.20	173,126	150.00
136,656	150.00	282,900	200.00
243,409	200.00		

CONSTANT MULTIPLIER CHART FOR 12-YEAR AMORTIZATION

Interest rate (%)	Annual constant multiplier
3.500	0.102174
4.000	0.105063
4.500	0.108001
5.000	0.110987
5.500	0.114021

CONSTANT MULTIPLIER CHART FOR 12-YEAR AMORTIZATION—Continued

Interest rate (%)	Annual constant multiplier
6.000	0.117102
6.800	0.122130
7.000	0.123406
7.900	0.129237
8.000	0.129894

CONSTANT MULTIPLIER CHART FOR 12-YEAR AMORTIZATION—Continued

Interest rate (%)	Annual constant multiplier
8.250	0.131545

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

Sample First-Year Monthly Repayment Amounts for a Single Borrower at Various Income and Debt Levels																			
Income	Initial Debt																		
	$5,000	$7,500	$10,000	$12,500	$15,000	$17,500	$20,000	$22,500	$25,000	$30,000	$35,000	$40,000	$45,000	$50,000	$60,000	$70,000	$80,000	$90,000	$100,000
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12,500	29	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
15,000	30	45	60	75	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
17,500	31	47	63	78	94	110	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122
20,000	33	50	67	83	100	116	133	150	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
22,500	35	53	70	88	106	123	141	158	176	205	205	205	205	205	205	205	205	205	205
25,000	37	56	75	93	112	130	149	168	186	224	247	247	247	247	247	247	247	247	247
30,000	42	62	83	104	125	145	166	187	208	249	291	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330
35,000	44	67	89	111	133	156	178	200	222	267	311	356	400	413	413	413	413	413	413
40,000	47	71	95	119	142	166	190	214	237	285	332	380	427	474	497	497	497	497	497
45,000	50	76	101	126	151	177	202	227	252	303	353	404	454	505	580	580	580	580	580
50,000	51	76	102	127	153	178	204	229	254	305	356	407	458	509	611	663	663	663	663
60,000	54	81	108	134	161	188	215	242	269	323	376	430	484	538	645	753	830	830	830
70,000	58	87	117	146	175	204	233	262	291	350	408	466	524	583	699	816	932	997	997
80,000	62	92	123	154	185	215	246	277	308	369	431	492	554	615	738	861	984	1107	1163
90,000	64	97	129	161	193	225	257	290	322	386	450	515	579	644	772	901	1030	1158	1287
100,000	67	100	134	167	201	234	268	301	335	402	468	535	602	669	803	937	1071	1205	1338
Sample repayment amounts are based on an interest rate of 6.80%.																			

Sample First-Year Monthly Repayment Amounts for a Married or Head-of-Household Borrower at Various Income and Debt Levels

Income	Family Size = 3																		
	Initial Debt																		
	$5,000	$7,500	$10,000	$12,500	$15,000	$17,500	$20,000	$22,500	$25,000	$30,000	$35,000	$40,000	$45,000	$50,000	$60,000	$70,000	$80,000	$90,000	$100,000
6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17,500	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
20,000	26	39	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
22,500	34	51	68	85	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
25,000	36	53	71	89	107	125	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131
30,000	39	59	79	98	118	137	157	177	196	214	214	214	214	214	214	214	214	214	214
35,000	44	65	87	109	131	152	174	196	218	261	297	297	297	297	297	297	297	297	297
40,000	47	71	94	118	141	165	189	212	236	283	330	377	381	381	381	381	381	381	381
45,000	51	76	101	176	152	177	202	228	253	303	354	404	455	464	464	464	464	464	464
50,000	51	76	102	122	153	178	204	229	254	305	356	407	458	509	547	547	547	547	547
60,000	53	79	105	132	158	185	211	237	264	316	369	422	475	527	633	714	714	714	714
70,000	56	84	112	140	169	197	225	253	281	337	393	449	506	562	674	787	881	881	881
80,000	60	89	119	149	179	209	239	268	298	358	417	477	537	596	716	835	954	1047	1047
90,000	63	95	126	158	189	221	252	284	315	378	442	505	568	631	757	883	1009	1135	1214
100,000	66	99	131	164	197	230	263	296	328	394	460	526	591	657	788	920	1051	1182	1314

Sample repayment amounts are based on an interest rate of 6.80%

[FR Doc. 07–2360 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000–01–C

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

National Board for Education Sciences

AGENCY: Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

ACTION: Notice of an open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of an upcoming meeting of the National Board for Education Sciences. The notice also describes the functions of the Committee. Notice of this meeting is required by Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and is intended to notify the public of their opportunity to attend. This notice is being posted in the **Federal Register** less than 15 days prior to the Board's meeting due to challenges in coordinating Board member schedules to attend the meeting.

DATES: May 23 and 24, 2007.

Times: May 23, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.; May 24, 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.

ADDRESSES: 80 F Street, NW., Room 100, Washington, DC 20208.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Grace Lucier, Designated Federal Official, National Board for Education Sciences, 555 New Jersey Ave., NW., Room 602 I, Washington, DC 20208; phone: (202) 219–2253; fax: (202) 219–1466; e-mail: *Mary.Grace.Lucier@ed.gov.*

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Board for Education Sciences is authorized by Section 116 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. The Board advises the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) on the establishment of activities to be supported by the Institute, on the funding for applications for grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for research after the completion of peer review, and reviews and evaluates the work of the Institute.

On May 23 the Board will receive a briefing from the Director of IES and staff on its activities and progress reports on projects underway since January 2007.

On May 24 the Board will discuss issues related to the reauthorization of the Education Sciences Reform Act and its pending contract to evaluate the effectiveness of the IES in carrying out its priorities and mission. The Board will also review the structure of its internal committees and discuss the appointment of an executive director. A final agenda will be available from Mary Grace Lucier (see contact information above) on May 16. Individuals who will need accommodations for a disability in order to attend the meeting (e.g., interpreting services, assistance listening devices, or materials in alternative format) should notify Mary Grace Lucier no later than May 16. We will attempt to meet requests for accommodations after this date but cannot guarantee their availability. The meeting site is accessible to individuals with disabilities.

Records are kept of all Committee proceedings and are available for public inspection at 555 New Jersey Ave., NW., Room 627 H, Washington, DC 20208, from the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time Monday through Friday.

Electronic Access to This Document: You may view this document as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: *http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister/index.html.*

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free at 1–888–293–6498; or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html.*

Grover J. Whitehurst,

Director, Institute of Education Sciences.

[FR Doc. E7–9142 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability; Certification Notice—213; Notice of Filing of Self-Certification of Coal Capability Under the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act; Otay Mesa Energy Center, LLC

AGENCY: Office Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of filing.

SUMMARY: On April 26, 2007, Otay Mesa Energy Center, LLC, as the owner and operator of a new base load electric powerplant, submitted a coal capability self-certification to the Department of Energy (DOE) pursuant to section 201(d) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (FUA), as amended, and DOE regulations in 10 CFR 501.60, 61. Section 201(d) of FUA requires DOE to publish a notice of receipt of the self-certification in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of self-certification filings are available for public inspection, upon request, in the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Room 8G–026, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell at (202) 586–9624.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title II of FUA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*), provides that no new base load electric powerplants may be constructed or operated without the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel as a primary energy source. Pursuant to FUA section 201(d), in order to meet the requirement of coal capability, the owner or operator of such facilities proposing to use natural gas or petroleum as its primary energy source shall certify to the Secretary of Energy (Secretary) prior to construction, or prior to operation as a base load electric powerplant, that such powerplant has the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel. Such certification establishes compliance with FUA section 201(a) as of the date it is filed with the Secretary. The Secretary is required to publish a notice in the **Federal Register** reciting that the certification has been filed.

The following owner of a proposed new base load electric powerplant has filed a self-certification of coal-capability with DOE pursuant to FUA section 201(d) and in accordance with DOE regulations in 10 CFR §§ 501.60, 61:

Owner: Otay Mesa Energy Center, LLC.

Capacity: 600 MW.

Plant Location: San Diego, CA.

In-Service Date: Second Quarter of 2009.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 7, 2007.

Anthony J. Como,

Director, Permitting and Siting, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

[FR Doc. E7–9082 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[OE Docket No. EA–327]

Application To Export Electric Energy; DC Energy, LLC

AGENCY: Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: DC Energy, LLC (DC Energy) has applied for authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada pursuant to section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act.

DATES: Comments, protests, or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests, or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Mail Code: OE–20, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585–0350 (FAX 202–586–8008).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell (Program Office) 202–586–9624 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202–586–2793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)).

On May 1, 2007, the Department of Energy (DOE) received an application from DC Energy for authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada as a power marketer. DC Energy, a Delaware limited partnership with its principal place of business in Vienna, Virginia, has requested an electricity export authorization with a 5-year term. DC Energy does not own or control any electric generation, transmission, or distribution assets, nor does it have a franchised service area. The electric energy which DC Energy proposes to export to Canada would be surplus energy purchased from electric utilities, Federal power marketing agencies, and other entities within the United States.

DC Energy will arrange for the delivery of exports to Canada over the international transmission facilities owned by Basin Electric Power Cooperative, Bonneville Power Administration, Eastern Maine Electric Cooperative, International Transmission Co., Joint Owners of the Highgate Project, Long Sault, Inc., Maine Electric Power Company, Maine Public Service Company, Minnesota Power, Inc., Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., New York Power Authority, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Northern States Power Company, Vermont Electric Power Company, and Vermont Electric Transmission Co.

The construction, operation, maintenance, and connection of each of the international transmission facilities to be utilized by DC Energy has previously been authorized by a Presidential permit issued pursuant to Executive Order 10485, as amended.

Procedural Matters: Any person desiring to become a party to these proceedings or to be heard by filing comments or protests to this application should file a petition to intervene, comment, or protest at the address provided above in accordance with §§ 385.211 or 385.214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of each petition and protest should be filed with DOE on or before the date listed above.

Comments on the DC Energy application to export electric energy to Canada should be clearly marked with Docket No. EA–327. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Stephen C. Palmer, Alston & Bird LLC, The Atlantic Building, 950 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20004–1404.

A final decision will be made on this application after the environmental impacts have been evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and a determination is made by DOE that the proposed action will not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Copies of this application will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above and at *http://www.oe.energy.gov/304.htm*.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 7, 2007.

Anthony J. Como,

Director, Permitting and Siting, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

[FR Doc. E7–9083 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board, Idaho National Laboratory

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a meeting of the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), Idaho National Laboratory. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) requires that public notice of this meeting be announced in the **Federal Register**.

DATES: Tuesday, May 22, 2007; 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Wednesday, May 23, 2007; 7:30 a.m.–2:30 p.m.

Opportunities for public participation will be held Tuesday, May 22, from 11:45 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. and 2:45 to 3 p.m.; and Wednesday, May 23, from 11:45 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.

These times are subject to change; please contact the Federal Coordinator (below) for confirmation of times prior to the meeting.

ADDRESSES: AmeriTel Inn, 645 Lindsey Boulevard, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert L. Pence, Federal Coordinator, Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office, 1955 Fremont Avenue, MS–1203, Idaho Falls, ID 83415. Phone (208) 526–6518; Fax (208) 526–8789 or e-mail: *pencerl@id.doe.gov* or visit the Board's Internet home page at: *http://www.inlemcab.org*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Board: The purpose of the Board is to make recommendations to DOE in the areas of environmental restoration, waste management, and related activities.

Tentative Topics (agenda topics may change up to the day of the meeting; please contact Robert L. Pence for the most current agenda):

- Reprocessing History
- Management of Employee Risk
- Operable Unit 03–14—Progress Update
- Power Burst Facility Evaluation/Cost Analysis Philosophy
- Engineering Test Reactor—Decontamination and Decommissioning Update
- Test Area North—Site Tour—Visualize Cleanup Progress
- Contractor Introductions and Project Overview—PIT–9 Decontamination and Decommissioning Update

Public Participation: The meeting is open to the public. Written statements may be filed with the Board either before or after the meeting. Individuals who wish to make oral presentations pertaining to agenda items should contact Robert L. Pence at the address or telephone number listed above. The request must be received five days prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made to include the presentation in the agenda. The Deputy Designated Federal Officer is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Individuals wishing to make

public comment will be provided a maximum of five minutes to present their comments. This notice is being published less than 15 days before the date of the meeting due to programmatic issues that had to be resolved.

Minutes: The minutes of this meeting will be available for public review and copying at the U.S. Department of Energy's Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585 between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Minutes will also be available by writing to Robert L. Pence, Federal Coordinator, at the address and phone number listed above.

Issued at Washington, DC, on May 7, 2007.

Rachel Samuel,

Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9084 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0711; FRL–8313–3]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to OMB for Review and Approval; Comment Request; NSPS for Sewage Sludge Treatment Plants (Renewal), EPA ICR Number 1063.10, OMB Control Number 2060–0035

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that an Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. This is a request to renew an existing approved collection. The ICR that is abstracted below describes the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost.

DATES: Additional comments may be submitted on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, referencing Docket ID Number EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0711, to (1) EPA online using *http://www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by e-mail to *docket.oeca@epa.gov*, or by mail to: EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), Environmental Protection Agency, Enforcement and Compliance Docket and Information Center, mail code 2201T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460, and (2) OMB at: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Schaefer, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Sector Policies and Programs Division (D243–05), Measurement Policy Group, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–0296; fax number: (919) 541–3207; e-mail address: *schaefer.john@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has submitted the following ICR to OMB for review and approval according to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR 1320.12. On October 5, 2006 (71 FR 58853), EPA sought comments on this ICR pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d). EPA received no comments. Any additional comments on this ICR should be submitted to EPA and OMB within 30 days of this notice.

EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under docket ID number EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0711, which is available for public viewing online at *http://www.regulations.gov*, or in person viewing at the Enforcement and Compliance Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566–1744 and the telephone number for the Enforcement and Compliance Docket is (202) 566–1752.

Use EPA's electronic docket and comment system at *http://www.regulations.gov* to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the docket, and to access those documents in the docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select ''docket search,'' then key in the docket ID number identified above. Please note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing at *http://www.regulations.gov*, as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose public disclosure is restricted by statute. For further information about the electronic docket, go to *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Title: NSPS for Sewage Sludge Treatment Plants (Renewal).

ICR Numbers: EPA ICR Number 1063.10, OMB Control Number 2060–0035.

ICR Status: This ICR is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2007. Under OMB regulations, the Agency may continue to conduct or sponsor the collection of information while this submission is pending at OMB. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations in title 40 of the CFR, after appearing in the **Federal Register** when approved, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, and displayed either by publication in the **Federal Register** or by other appropriate means, such as on the related collection instrument or form, if applicable. The display of OMB control numbers in certain EPA regulations is consolidated in 40 CFR part 9.

Abstract: This Information Collection Request (ICR) renewal is being submitted for the NSPS for Sewage Sludge Treatment Plants (40 CFR part 60, subpart O), which were promulgated on February 28, 1974. These standards apply to each incinerator which combusts wastes containing more than 10 percent of sewage sludge (dry basis) produced by municipal sewage treatment plants, or each incinerator which charges more than 1000 kg (2205 lb.) per day municipal sewage sludge (dry basis), and any facility that commenced construction, modification or reconstruction after June 11, 1973. Owners and operators of facilities subject to NSPS must notify EPA of construction, reconstruction, anticipated and actual startup dates, and results of performance tests. Records of performance test results, shutdowns, and malfunctions must be maintained. These notifications, reports, and records are essential in determining compliance; and are required, in general, of all sources subject to NSPS.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 55 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any

previously applicable instructions and requirements which have subsequently changed; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Sewage sludge treatment plants.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 54.

Frequency of Response: Initially and semiannually.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 6,209.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: $2,382,804, which comprises $100,000 in annualized capital/start-up costs, $1,890,000 in Operating & Maintenance costs and $392,804 in labor costs.

Changes in the Estimates: There is a slight reduction in the annual hour burden by 5 hours due to a correction in the Agency Burden Tables. There is no change in the total annual capital or O&M costs currently identified in the OMB Inventory of Approved ICR Burdens.

Dated: April 30, 2007.

Sara Hisel-McCoy,

Acting Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. E7–9112 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0931; FRL–8313–5]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to OMB for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Performance Evaluation Studies on Water and Wastewater Laboratories (Renewal); EPA ICR No. 0234.09, OMB Control No. 2080–0021

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)(44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that an Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. This is a request to renew an existing approved collection. The ICR, which is abstracted below, describes the nature of the information collection and its estimated burden and cost.

DATES: Additional comments may be submitted on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, referencing Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0931 to (1) EPA online using *www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), by e-mail to *docket.oeca@epa.gov*, or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Enforcement and Compliance Docket and Information Center, Mail Code: 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460, and (2) OMB by mail to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Yellin, Office of Compliance, Agriculture Division, Laboratory Data Integrity Branch, 2225A, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 202–564–2970; fax number: 202–564–0029, e-mail address: *yellin.patrick@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has submitted the following ICR to OMB for review and approval according to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR 1320.12. On January 3, 2007 (72 FR 130), EPA sought comments on this ICR pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d). EPA published a second notice on January 22, 2007 (72 FR 2684), to make a correction to the first notice. EPA received 1 comment during the comment period, which is addressed in the ICR. Any additional comments on this ICR should be submitted to EPA and OMB within 30 days of this notice.

EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0931, which is available for online viewing at *www.regulations.gov*, or in person viewing at the Enforcement and Compliance Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA/DC Public Reading Room is open from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is 202–566–1744, and the telephone number for the Enforcement and Compliance Docket is 202–566–1752.

Use EPA's electronic docket and comment system at *www.regulations.gov*, to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the docket, and to access those documents in the docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select ''docket search,'' then key in the docket ID number identified above. Please note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing at *www.regulations.gov* as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose public disclosure is restricted by statute. For further information about the electronic docket, go to *www.regulations.gov*.

Title: Performance Evaluation Studies on Water and Wastewater Laboratories (Renewal).

ICR numbers: EPA ICR No. 0234.09, OMB Control No. 2080–0021.

ICR Status: This ICR is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2007. Under OMB regulations, the Agency may continue to conduct or sponsor the collection of information while this submission is pending at OMB. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations in title 40 of the CFR, after appearing in the **Federal Register** when approved, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, are displayed either by publication in the **Federal Register** or by other appropriate means, such as on the related collection instrument or form, if applicable. The display of OMB control numbers in certain EPA regulations is consolidated in 40 CFR Part 9.

Abstract: Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR–QA) participation is mandatory for major and selected minor permit holders under the Clean Water Act's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), Section 308. The DMR–QA study is designed to evaluate the entire process used by permittees to routinely report monitoring results in Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs). The study addresses the analytic ability of the laboratories that perform chemical, microbiological and whole effluent toxicity (WET) analyses required in the NPDES permits and the ability to properly report these results in the DMRs. Under DMR–QA, the permit holder is responsible for obtaining un-graded results of analyses of test samples performed by in-house and/or contract laboratories, and submitting these results to the appropriate federal or state NPDES regulatory authority and the commercial proficiency testing (PT) provider that supplies the test samples. Permit holders are responsible for submitting corrective action reports to the appropriate regulatory authority.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 6.3 hours per response. Burden means the total time,

effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements which have subsequently changed; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Respondents in DMR–QA studies are NPDES permittees designated by the EPA region or state with permitting responsibility and the laboratories doing whole-effluent toxicity testing for these major dischargers. These respondents are most likely from the following SIC Codes: 2011—through 3999—Manufacturers; 4941—Water supply systems; 4952—Sewerage systems; 8734—Water testing laboratories.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 7516.

Frequency of Response: Once annually.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 47,351 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: $2,494,260, includes $1,240,140 annualized O&M costs and $1,254,120 annual labor costs.

Changes in the Estimates: There is a decrease of 132,984 hours in the total estimated burden currently identified in the OMB Inventory of Approved ICR Burdens. This decrease is primarily due to the fact that this renewal ICR does not include burden associated with the Water Pollution and Water Supply studies that were covered under the previous ICR. Some of this decrease was offset by a slight increase in the number of respondents, burden hours and costs for the DMR–QA study

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Sara Hisel McCoy,

Acting Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. E7–9113 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0705; FRL–8313–4]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to OMB for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Air Emission Standards for Tanks, Surface Impoundments, and Containers (Renewal); EPA ICR Number 1593.07; OMB Control Number 2060–0318

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that an Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. This is a request to renew an existing approved collection. The ICR that is abstracted below describes the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost.

DATES: Additional comments may be submitted on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, referencing docket ID number EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0705, to (1) EPA online using *http://www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by e-mail to *docket.oeca@epa.gov,* or by mail to: EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), Environmental Protection Agency, Enforcement and Compliance Docket and Information Center, mail code 2201T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460, and (2) OMB at: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Schaefer, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Sector Policies and Programs Division (D243–05), Measurement Policy Group, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–0296; fax number: (919) 541–3207; e-mail address: *schaefer.john@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has submitted the following ICR to OMB for review and approval according to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR 1320.12. On October 5, 2006 (71 FR 58853), EPA sought comments on this ICR pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d). EPA received no comments. Any additional comments on this ICR should be submitted to EPA and OMB within 30 days of this notice.

EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under docket ID number EPA–HQ–OECA–2006–0705, which is available for public viewing online at *http://www.regulations.gov,* in person viewing at the Enforcement and Compliance Docket and Information Center in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566–1744 and the telephone number for the Enforcement and Compliance Docket and Information Center is (202) 566–1927.

Use EPA's electronic docket and comment system at *http://www.regulations.gov* to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the docket, and to access those documents in the docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select ''docket search,'' then key in the docket ID number identified above. Please note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically, or in paper, will be made available for public viewing at *http://www.regulations.gov,* as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose public disclosure is restricted by statute. For further information about the electronic docket, go to *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Title: Air Emission Standards for Tanks, Surface Impoundments and Containers (Renewal).

ICR Numbers: EPA ICR Number 1593.07; OMB Control Number 2060–0318.

ICR Status: This ICR is scheduled to expire on September 31, 2007. Under OMB regulations, the Agency may continue to conduct, or sponsor the collection of information while this submission is pending at OMB. An Agency may not conduct, or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations in title 40 of the CFR, after appearing in the **Federal Register** when approved, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, and displayed either by publication in the **Federal Register**, or by other appropriate means, such as on the related collection instrument, or form, if applicable. The display of OMB control numbers in certain EPA regulations is consolidated in 40 CFR part 9.

Abstract: This Information Collection Request (ICR) renewal is being submitted for the Air Emission Standards for Tanks, Surface Impoundments and Containers (40 CFR Part 264, Subpart CC and 40 CFR Part 265, Subpart CC), which were promulgated on December 6, 1994. The requirements of this subpart apply to owners and operators of all facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous wastes in tanks, surface impoundments and containers that are subject to subparts I, J or K of these parts, except for Sections 264.1 and 265.1 and those management units identified at Sections 264.1080(b) and 265.1080(b). Also, the requirements of this subpart apply to large quantity generators that manage hazardous wastes in either tanks, or containers (262.34(a)(1)(i and ii)). The affected entities are subject to the General Provisions of the NSPS at 40 CFR part 60, subpart A and any changes, or additions to the General Provisions specified at 40 CFR part 264, subpart CC and 40 CFR part 265, subpart CC.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 114 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose, or provide information to, or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements which have subsequently changed; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit, or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are sewage tanks, surface impoundments and containers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 6,209.

Frequency of Response: Annually and semiannually.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 711,409.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: $57,632,335, which is comprised of $0 in annualized capital/start-up costs, $12,418,000 O&M costs, and $45,214,335 in labor costs.

Changes in the Estimates: There is a small reduction of 68 hours in total hourly burden. This change is due to the correction of a mathematical error in the total estimated burden currently identified in the OMB Inventory of Approved ICR Burdens.

Dated: April 25, 2007.

Sara Hisel-McCoy,

Acting Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. E7–9144 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–8313–7]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition To Object to Title V Permit for BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc.'s Gathering Center 1, Prudhoe Bay, AK

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA) section 505(b)(2) and 40 CFR 70.8(d), the EPA Administrator signed an order dated April 20, 2007, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) to BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc.'s (BPX) Gathering Center 1 (Revision 1 to GC1 permit), Prudhoe Bay, Alaska. This order constitutes final action on the petition filed by Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) on behalf of Bill MacClarence on April 14, 2004, requesting that EPA object to the issuance of Revision 1 to the GC1 permit. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the CAA, any person may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this notice under section 307 of the CAA.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the final order, the petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Office of Air, Waste, and Toxics (AWT–107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. The final order is also available electronically at the following Web site: *http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitiondb.htm.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Natasha Greaves, Office of Air, Waste and Toxics, EPA Region 10, telephone (206) 553–7079, e-mail *greaves.natasha@epa.gov.* Interested parties may also contact the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Air Quality, 555 Cordova Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501–2617.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Clean Air Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review and object to, as appropriate, operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities. Section 505(b)(2) of the CAA authorizes any person to petition the EPA Administrator within 60 days after the expiration of this review period to object to a state operating permit if EPA has not done so. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the state, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or that the grounds for the objection or other issue arose after the comment period.

On April 19, 2004, EPA received a petition from PEER on behalf of Bill MacClarence requesting that EPA object to the issuance of Revision 1 to the GC1 permit on the grounds that: (1) Revision 1 to the GC1 Permit violates Title V of the CAA because it does not explain the departure from ADEC's March 7, 2003 draft permit and because the provisions of Prevention of Significant Deterioration, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, and New Source Performance Standards are all based on the aggregated impact of air emissions and this permit did not aggregate all facilities within the Prudhoe Bay Unit (PBU); (2) the pollution consequences of this violation are significant becasue elevated levels of nitrogen oxide on the North Slope of Alaska present a serious health problem for workers and native communities in the region and have been created by not aggregating facilities within the PBU; and (3) ADEC and EPA failed to exercise proper regulatory oversight in this matter by issuing the final permit with no public notice or discussion. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's decision to deny PEER's petition for objection on all grounds.

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Elin D. Miller,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 07–2334 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6686–8]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at 202–564–7167.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 6, 2007 (72 FR 17156).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20070033, ERP No. D–FTA–C54010–00, Access to the Region's Core Project, To Increase Trans-Hudson Commuter Rail Capacity, Improve System Safety and Reliability between Secaucus Junction Station in NJ and midtown Manhattan, Funding, Hudson County, NJ and New York County, NY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to wetlands and air quality. EPA recommends that FTA provides more information on cumulative impacts as well as a wetlands mitigation plan. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070078, ERP No. D–NPS–C61011–NY, Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, General Management Plan, Implementation, Oyster Bay, Nassau County, NY.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action. Rating LO.

EIS No. 20070097, ERP No. D–NOA–A91075–00, Programmatic—Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program (MMHSRP), Day-to-Day Operation on Stranding, Response, Rehabilitation, Release, and Disentanglement Activities.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project.

However, EPA did request that NMFS clarify questions pertaining to water quality, contaminants, and human health. Rating LO.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20070057, ERP No. F–FHW–E40763–NC, Winston-Salem Northern Beltway, (Eastern Section) U.S. 52 south to I–40 Business and I–40 Business south to U.S. 311, Improvements to the Surface Transportation Network, TIP Project Nos. U2579 and U–2579A, Forsyth County, NC (This EIS #20070057 and EIS #20070058 are combined in a single document.)

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about impacts to streams, terrestrial forest habitat, and impacts to migratory birds. EPA recommends that the Record of Decision disclose planned mitigation for these impacts.

EIS No. 20070106, ERP No. F–FRC–H03002–00, Rockies Express Western Phase Project, Construction and Operation for the Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities: Rockies Express (CP06–354–000), TransColorado (CP06–401–000) and Overthrust (CP06–423–000), CO, WY, NE, KS, MO and NM.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project, but recommends additional consideration be given to potential invasive species transfer via hydrostatic testing.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Ken Mittelholtz,

Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E7–9138 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6686–7]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information, (202) 564–7167 or *http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/.*

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed through pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9

EIS No. 20070176, Draft EIS, AFS, CO, Spruce Creek Project, Proposed Timber Harvest, Temporary Road Construction, Thinning of Sub-Merchantable Trees, Enhancement of Asper and Whitebark Pine, Cascade Ranger District, Boise National Forest, Valley County, ID, Comment Period Ends: 6/25/2007, Contact: Keith Dimmett, 208–382–7400.

EIS No. 20070177, Draft EIS, AFS, OR, Spears Vegetation Management Project, Proposal to Use Commercial Timber Harvest, Precommercial Thinning, Prescribed Fire, Grapple Piling and Hand Piling in the Mark Creek Watershed and Veaqie Creek Subwatershed, Lookout Mountain Ranger District, Ochoco National Forest, Crook and Wheeler Counties, OR, Comment Period Ends: 6/25/2007, Contact: Katherine Farrell, 541–416–6500.

EIS No. 20070178, Final EIS, AFS, 00, Kootenai National Forest Invasive Plant Management, Proposes to Manage Noxious Weed and Invasive Plant Species, Lincoln Sanders, Flathead Counties, MT and Bonner and Boundary Counties, ID, Wait Period Ends: 6/11/2007, Contact: John Gubel, 406–283–7774.

EIS No. 20070179, Final Supplement, AFS, WA, School Fire Salvage Recovery Project, To Clarify Definitions of Live and Dead Trees, Implementation, Pomeroy Ranger District, Umatilla National Forest, Columbia and Garfield Counties, WA, Wait Period Ends: 6/11/2007, Contact: Dean R. Millett, 509–843–1891.

EIS No. 20070180, Final EIS, NOA, 00, Programmatic—Steller Sea Lion and Northern Fur Seal Research, Proposal to Disburse Funds and Issue Permit for Research, AK, WA, OR and CA, Wait Period Ends: 6/11/2007, Contact: P. Michael Payne, 301–713–2289.

EIS No. 20070181, Draft EIS, FHW, VT, Middlebury Spur Project, Improvements to the Freight Transportation System in the Town of Middlebury in Addison County to the Town of Pittsford in Rutland County, VT, Comment Period Ends: 6/29/2007, Contact: Kenneth Sikora, Jr., 802–828–4423.

EIS No. 20070182, Final EIS, COE, MD, Masonville Dredged Material Containment Facility, New Information, New Source of Dike Building Material from the Seagirt Dredging Project within the Patapsco River, Funding, Baltimore, MD, Wait Period Ends: 6/11/2007, Contact: Jon Romeo, 410–962–6079.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 20070080, Draft EIS, NIG, CA, Graton Rancheria Casino and Hotel Project, Transfer of Land into Trust, Implementation, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (Tribe), Sonoma County, CA, Comment Period Ends: 6/4/2007, Contact: Brad Mehaffy, 202–632–7003. Revision of FR Notice Published 3/9/2007: Extending Comment Period from 5/14/2007 to 6/4/2007.

EIS No. 20070103, Draft EIS, FHW, NY, Kosciuszko Bridge Project, Propose Rehabilitation or Replacement a 1.1 mile Segment Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (− 278) from Morgan Avenue in Brooklyn and the Long Island Expressway (1495) in Queens, Kings and Queens Counties, NY, Comment Period Ends: 6/15/2007, Contact: Robert Arnold, 518–431–4127. Revision of FR Notice Published

3/23/2007: Extending Comment Period from 5/25/2007 to 6/15/2007.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Ken Mittelholtz,

Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E7–9136 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–8313–6]

Notice of Open Meeting, Environmental Financial Advisory Board (EFAB), Workshop on Environmental Management Systems

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Financial Advisory Board will hold an open meeting of its Environmental Management Systems Project Workgroup.

EFAB is chartered with providing analysis and advice to the EPA Administrator and EPA program offices on issues relating to environmental finance. The purpose of this meeting is for the EFAB to gather information and ideas with respect to how professionals in the areas of commercial banking/debt, insurance, and equity investment view and/or use a corporation's environmental information such as Environmental Management Systems (EMSs) in their work. The day will structured to address this issue via a series of panel discussions involving public and private experts in these areas.

The meeting is open to the public with limited seating available on a first come first served basis. Due to building security requirements, all members of the public who wish to attend the meeting must register in advance no later than Wednesday, June 6, 2007.

DATES: June 12, 2007 from 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Potomac Yard Conference Center, One Potomac Yard, 2777 S. Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202–3553.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To register for the workshop or to obtain further information, contact Vanessa Bowie, Director, Environmental Finance Staff, U.S. EPA, at 202–564–5186 or *bowie.vanessa@epa.gov.*

For information on access or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Vanessa Bowie at 202–564–5186 or *bowie.vanessa@epa.gov.* To request accommodation of disability, please contact Vanessa Bowie, preferably at least 10 days prior to the meeting, to give EPA as much time as possible to process your request.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Joseph Dillon,

Director, Office of Enterprise Technology and Innovation.

[FR Doc. E7–9120 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–8313–9]

Science Advisory Board Staff Office; Notification of a Public Teleconference of the Science Advisory Board; Environmental Economics Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) Staff Office is announcing a public teleconference of the SAB Environmental Economics Advisory Committee (EEAC) to discuss its draft advisory report to EPA regarding issues in valuing mortality risk reduction.

DATES: The teleconference will be held from 1 p.m.–4 p.m. Eastern time on June 4, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Any member of the public wishing further information regarding the public teleconference and call-in number may contact Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board Staff Office by telephone/voice mail at (202) 343–9867, or via e-mail at *stallworth.holly@epa.gov.* The SAB mailing address is: U.S. EPA, Science Advisory Board (1400F), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. General information about the SAB, as well as any updates concerning the public teleconference announced in this notice, may be found in the SAB Web Site at: *http://www.epa.gov/sab.* The technical contact for EPA's work on valuing mortality risk reduction is Dr. Chris Dockins who may be reached at (202) 566–2286 or *dockins.chris@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the SAB Environmental Economics Advisory Committee will hold a public teleconference to discuss appropriate methods for valuing mortality risks. The SAB EEAC will be augmented by economists from the chartered Science Advisory Board as well as the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis. The SAB was established by 42 U.S.C. 4365 to provide independent scientific and technical advice to the Administrator on the technical basis for Agency positions and regulations. The SAB is a Federal Advisory Committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended, 5 U.S.C., App. The SAB will comply with the provisions of FACA and all appropriate SAB Staff Office procedural policies.

Background

The SAB EEAC has been asked to review two papers related to EPA's issues in valuing mortality risk reduction. The first paper entitled ''Report of the EPA Work Group on VSL Meta-Analyses'' addresses the application of meta analysis techniques to the derivation of estimates for mortality risk reduction. A second paper, entitled ''Willingness to Pay for Environmental Health Risk Reductions when there are Varying Degrees of Life Expectancy: A White Paper'' discusses appropriate and available methods for valuing mortality risk reductions when affected populations have varying life expectancies. *http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eerm.nsf/vwRepNumLookup/EE–0495?OpenDocument.* These papers are posted at: *http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eerm.nsf/vwRepNumLookup/EE–0494?OpenDocument* and *http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eerm.nsf/vwRepNumLookup/EE–0495?OpenDocument.* The SAB EEAC met on September 14–15, 2006 (71 FR 48546), and a teleconference was held on October 30, 2006 (71 FR 59779–59780). During the June 4, 2007 teleconference, the SAB EEAC members will discuss their draft advisory responding to EPA's charge questions on the two papers cited above.

Availability of Teleconference Materials: Materials in support of the teleconference, including the SAB EEAC's draft response to the Agency's charge, will be placed on the SAB Web Site at *http://www.epa.gov/sab/panels/eeac_adv_val_mortal_rick_reduc.htm* prior to the teleconference.

Procedures for Providing Public Input: Interested members of the public may submit relevant written or oral information for the SAB to consider during the advisory process.

Oral Statements: In general, individuals or groups requesting an oral presentation at a public teleconference will be limited to five minutes per

speaker, with no more than a total of one hour for all speakers. Interested parties should contact Dr. Stallworth, DFO, at the contact information noted above, by May 25, 2007, to be placed on the public speaker list for the June 4, 2007 teleconference. *Written Statements:* Written statements should be received in the SAB Staff Office by May 25, 2007, so that the information may be made available to the SAB for their consideration prior to this teleconference. Written statements should be supplied to the DFO in the following formats: One hard copy with original signature, and one electronic copy via e-mail to *stallworth.holly@epa.gov* (acceptable file format: Adobe Acrobat PDF, WordPerfect, MS Word, MS PowerPoint, or Rich Text files in IBM–PC/Windows 98/2000/XP format).

Meeting Access: For information on access or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Dr. Stallworth at (202) 343–9867 or *stallworth.holly@epa.gov.* To request accommodation of a disability, please contact Dr. Stallworth, preferably at least 10 days prior to the meeting to give EPA as much time as possible to process your request.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Anthony F. Maciorowski,

Deputy Director, EPA Science Advisory Board Staff Office.

[FR Doc. E7–9099 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–ORD–2007–0362; FRL–8313–8]

Notice of Availability of the Draft Final Report: ''Comparison of the Alternative Asbestos Control Method and the NESHAP Method for Demolition of Asbestos-Containing Buildings''

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of document availability and invitation for public comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is announcing a public comment period and independent, external peer review for the draft Final Report for the Alternative Asbestos Control Method (AACM) Demonstration Project. The external peer review is expected to include a face-to-face meeting in Cincinnati, OH. The time and location for the external peer review meeting have not yet been determined and will be specified in a separate **Federal Register** notice. EPA expects to invite the public to attend the meeting and to provide an opportunity to the public to make comments at the meeting. The public comment period and the external peer review provide opportunities for all interested parties to comment on the report. In addition to consideration by EPA, all public comments submitted in accordance with this notice will also be forwarded to EPA's contractor for consideration by the external peer review panel prior to the meeting.

EPA is releasing this draft document solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination peer review under applicable information quality guidelines. This document has not been formally disseminated by EPA. This draft Final Report does not represent and should not be construed to represent any EPA policy, viewpoint, or determination.

The U.S. EPA conducted a controlled demonstration to evaluate the AACM alongside the current National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) method in a remote, secure location at Fort Chaffee, Arkansas. To facilitate side-by-side comparison, the demonstration used two similar structures with asbestos-containing materials. Additional information about this research project, including a description of the AACM and the project schedule, is available at *http://epa.gov/region6/6xa/asbestos.htm*.

DATES: The public comment period for this draft Final Report begins with the publication of this notice. Comments may be submitted by June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Members of the public may obtain the draft Final Report from *www.regulations.gov* or from Stephen Watkins via the contact information below.

Public comments should be identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–ORD–2007–0362, and submitted by one of the following methods:

- *www.regulations.gov:* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- *E-mail: ORD.Docket@epa.gov*.
- *Mail:* ORD Docket, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460
- *Hand Delivery:* EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), Room 3334, EPA West Building, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460, Attention Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–ORD–2007–0362. Deliveries are only accepted from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-ORD–2007–0362. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *www.regulations.gov*, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through *www.regulations.gov* or e-mail. The *www.regulations.gov* Web site is an ''anonymous access'' system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA, without going through *www.regulations.gov*, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD–ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: All documents in the docket are listed in the *www.regulations.gov* index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in *www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at the ORD Docket, EPA/DC, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the ORD Docket is (202) 566–1752.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you would like additional information regarding the draft Final Report, or EPA's independent, external peer

review process, please contact Stephen Watkins, Office of Research and Development, Mail Code 8104-R, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–3744; fax number: (202) 565–2925, E-mail: *watkins.stephen@epa.gov*.

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Jeff Morris,

Acting Director, Office of Science Policy.

[FR Doc. E7–9098 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The application also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States. 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 each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than June 5, 2007.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Andre Anderson, Vice President) 1000 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309:

1. SouthCrest Financial Group, Inc., Fayetteville, Georgia; to acquire 100 percent of the outstanding shares of Bank of Chickamauga, Chickamauga, Georgia.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Jacqueline G. King, Community Affairs Officer) 90 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480-0291:

1. Mesaba Bancshares, Inc., Grand Rapids, Minnesota; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Evergreen Bancshares, Inc., Two Harbors, Minnesota, and thereby indirectly acquire The Lake Bank, Two Harbors, Minnesota.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 7, 2007.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. E7–9063 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–S

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The application also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States. 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 each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than June 7, 2007.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of New York (Anne MacEwen, Bank Applications Officer) 33 Liberty Street, New York, New York 10045-0001:

1. Citizens Community Bancorp Inc., Ridgewood, New Jersey; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of Citizens Community Bank, Ridgewood, New Jersey.

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

1. Prairieland Bancorp Employee Stock Ownership Plan and Trust, Bushnell, Illinois; to increase its ownership from 43.13 percent to 48.01 percent of the voting shares of Prairieland Bancorp, Inc., Bushnell, Illinois, and thereby indirectly increase its ownership of Farmers and Merchants State Bank, Bushnell, Illinois.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 8, 2007.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. E7–9094 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

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 June 5, 2007.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Tracy Basinger, Director, Regional and Community Bank Group) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105-1579:

1. Franklin Resources, Inc., San Mateo, California; to retain 5.04 percent of the voting shares of TrustCo Bank Corp NY, Glenville, New York, a Federal Savings Bank, and thereby engage in operating a savings association pursuant to section 225.28(b)(4)(ii) of Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 7, 2007.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. E7–9062 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

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 May 29, 2007.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (David Tatum, Vice President) 1000 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309:

1. GB&T Bancshares, Inc., Gainesville, Georgia; to acquire GB&T Mortgage, Inc., Cumming, Georgia, and thereby engage in making, acquiring, brokering, or servicing loans or other extensions of credit, pursuant to section 225.28(b)(1) of Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 8, 2007.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. E7–9095 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–S

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

[Document Identifier: OS–0990–0000; 60-day notice]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of the Secretary (OS), Department of Health and Human Services, is publishing the following summary of a proposed collection for public comment. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

Type of Information Collection Request: New collection.

Title of Information Collection: Homelessness Data for Health and Human Services Mainstream Programs.

Form/OMB No.: 0990–0000.

Use: The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation will study data collection practices by Temporary Assistant for Needy Families (TANF) and Medicaid state programs regarding homelessness and housing status. Telephone interviews will be conducted with state officials from all 50 states and the District of Columbia who administer the TANF and Medicaid programs to collect information about the type and quality of data related to homelessness and housing status that are collected from and recorded about TANF and Medicaid applicants. This information will be used to determine whether these two HHS mainstream programs are collecting information from program applicants and/or participants regarding their housing status.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: State, Local and Tribal Government.

Annual Number of Respondents: 102.

Total Annual Responses: 102.

Average Burden per Response: 60 minutes.

Total Annual Hours: 102.

To obtain copies of the supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed paperwork collections referenced above, e-mail your request, including your address, phone number, OMB number, and OS document identifier, to *Sherette.funncoleman@hhs.gov*, or call the Reports Clearance Office on (202) 690–6162. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections must be received with 60-days, and directed to the OS Paperwork Clearance Officer at the following address: Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Assistant Secretary for Resources and Technology, Office of Resources Management, *Attention:* Sherrette Funn-Coleman (0990–0000), Room 537–H, 200 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20201.

Dated: May 2, 2007.

Alice Bettencourt,

Office of the Secretary, Paperwork Reduction Act Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9068 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology; American Health Information Community Population Health and Clinical Care Connections Workgroup Meeting

ACTION: Announcement of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the 16th meeting of the American Health Information Community Population Health and Clinical Care Connections Workgroup [formerly Biosurveillance Workgroup] in accordance with the

Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.).

DATES: June 15, 2007, from 10 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. [Eastern time].

ADDRESSES: Hubert H. Humphrey Building (200 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20201), Conference Room 705A (please bring photo ID for entry to a Federal building).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *http://www.hhs.gov/healthit/ahic/population/*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Workgroup will continue its discussion on how to facilitate the flow of reliable health information among population health and clinical care systems necessary to protect and improve the public's health. This meeting will focus on countermeasure allocation, distribution and administration, as well as automated integration with response registries.

The meeting will be available via Web cast. For additional information, go to: *http://www.hhs.gov/healthit/ahic/population/pop_instruct.html*.

Dated: May 3, 2007.

Judith Sparrow,

Director, American Health Information Community, Office of Programs and Coordination, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 07–2328 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–24–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

[Document Identifier: CMS–855]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, HHS.

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) is publishing the following summary of proposed collections for public comment. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

1. *Type of Information Collection Request*: Extension of a currently approved collection; *Title of Information Collection*: Medicare Enrollment Application; *Form Number*: CMS–855 (OMB#: 0938–0685); *Use*: The primary function of the Medicare enrollment application is to gather information from a provider or supplier that tells us who it is, whether it meets certain qualifications to be a health care provider or supplier, where it practices or renders its services, the identity of the owners of the enrolling entity, and information necessary to establish the correct claims payment. The goal of evaluating and revising the Medicare enrollment applications is to simplify and clarify the information collection without jeopardizing our need to collect specific information.

We are proposing revisions to the CMS–855B to incorporate changes adopted in CMS–1321–FC (71 FR 69624), ''Revisions to Payment Policies and Five-Year Review of Relative Value Units Under the Physician Fee Schedule for CY 2007 and Other Changes to Payment Under Part B; Revisions to Ambulance Fee Schedule; Ambulatory Inflation Factor Update for CY 2007.'' Specifically, CMS is revising the CMS–855B to:

- Add instructions to Attachment 2 that explain the independent diagnostic testing facility (IDTF) liability insurance requirements in 42 CFR 410.33(g)(6).
- Require that an IDTF submit copies of its comprehensive liability insurance policy in Section 17.
- List all of the new IDTF standards on a separate page in Attachment 2.
- Remove the supplier type ''Voluntary Health/Charitable Agency'' from Section 2A.

In addition, we are trying to enhance our ability to identify whether a hospital qualifies as a ''specialty hospital.'' To this end, we propose to revise the CMS–855A to include a specific box that specialty hospitals must check when completing the application. Instructions explaining the definition of a ''specialty hospital'' will also be added to the form. We also provide clarification of the term ''primary practice location'' in the instructions in Section 4 of the CMS–855A. This clarification does not change any data elements on the form. We are also removing the data element ''Medicare Year-End Cost Report Date'' in Section 2 of the CMS–855A, as this information is no longer needed.

Frequency: Recordkeeping and Reporting—On occasion; *Affected Public*: Business or other for-profit and Not-for-profit institutions; *Number of Respondents*: 400,000; *Total Annual Responses*: 400,000; *Total Annual Hours*: 1,001,503.33.

To obtain copies of the supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed paperwork collections referenced above, access CMS' Web Site address at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/PaperworkReductionActof1995*, or E-mail your request, including your address, phone number, OMB number, and CMS document identifier, to *Paperwork@cms.hhs.gov*, or call the Reports Clearance Office on (410) 786–1326.

To be assured consideration, comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections must be received at the address below, no later than 5 p.m. on July 10, 2007.

CMS, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs, Division of Regulations Development—C, *Attention*: Bonnie L Harkless, Room C4–26–05, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21244–1850.

Dated: May 3, 2007.

Michelle Shortt,

Director, Regulations Development Group, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. E7–9079 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

Current List of Laboratories Which Meet Minimum Standards To Engage in Urine Drug Testing for Federal Agencies

AGENCY: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) notifies Federal agencies of the laboratories currently certified to meet the standards of Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs (Mandatory Guidelines). The Mandatory Guidelines were first published in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 1988 (53 FR 11970), and subsequently revised in the **Federal Register** on June 9, 1994 (59 FR 29908), on September 30, 1997 (62 FR 51118), and on April 13, 2004 (69 FR 19644).

A notice listing all currently certified laboratories is published in the **Federal Register** during the first week of each month. If any laboratory's certification is suspended or revoked, the laboratory will be omitted from subsequent lists until such time as it is restored to full certification under the Mandatory Guidelines.

If any laboratory has withdrawn from the HHS National Laboratory Certification Program (NLCP) during the past month, it will be listed at the end, and will be omitted from the monthly listing thereafter.

This notice is also available on the Internet at *http://workplace.samhsa.gov* and *http://www.drugfreeworkplace.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Giselle Hersh or Dr. Walter Vogl, Division of Workplace Programs, SAMHSA/CSAP, Room 2–1035, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Rockville, Maryland 20857; 240–276–2600 (voice), 240–276–2610 (fax).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Mandatory Guidelines were developed in accordance with Executive Order 12564 and section 503 of Public Law 100–71. Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines, ''Certification of Laboratories Engaged in Urine Drug Testing for Federal Agencies,'' sets strict standards that laboratories must meet in order to conduct drug and specimen validity tests on urine specimens for Federal agencies. To become certified, an applicant laboratory must undergo three rounds of performance testing plus an on-site inspection. To maintain that certification, a laboratory must participate in a quarterly performance testing program plus undergo periodic, on-site inspections.

Laboratories which claim to be in the applicant stage of certification are not to be considered as meeting the minimum requirements described in the HHS Mandatory Guidelines. A laboratory must have its letter of certification from HHS/SAMHSA (formerly: HHS/NIDA) which attests that it has met minimum standards.

In accordance with Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines dated April 13, 2004 (69 FR 19644), the following laboratories meet the minimum standards to conduct drug and specimen validity tests on urine specimens:

ACL Laboratories, 8901 W. Lincoln Ave., West Allis, WI 53227, 414–328–7840/800–877–7016 (Formerly: Bayshore Clinical Laboratory)

ACM Medical Laboratory, Inc., 160 Elmgrove Park, Rochester, NY 14624, 585–429–2264

Advanced Toxicology Network, 3560 Air Center Cove, Suite 101, Memphis, TN 38118, 901–794–5770/888–290–1150

Aegis Analytical Laboratories, Inc., 345 Hill Ave., Nashville, TN 37210, 615–255–2400

Baptist Medical Center-Toxicology Laboratory, 9601 I–630, Exit 7, Little Rock, AR 72205–7299, 501–202–2783 (Formerly: Forensic Toxicology Laboratory Baptist Medical Center)

Clinical Reference Lab, 8433 Quivira Road, Lenexa, KS 66215–2802, 800–445–6917

Diagnostic Services, Inc., dba DSI, 12700 Westlinks Drive, Fort Myers, FL 33913, 239–561–8200/800–735–5416

Doctors Laboratory, Inc., 2906 Julia Drive, Valdosta, GA 31602, 229–671–2281

DrugScan, Inc., P.O. Box 2969, 1119 Mearns Road, Warminster, PA 18974, 215–674–9310

Dynacare Kasper Medical Laboratories*, 10150–102 St., Suite 200, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5J 5E2, 780–451–3702/800–661–9876

ElSohly Laboratories, Inc., 5 Industrial Park Drive, Oxford, MS 38655, 662–236–2609

Gamma-Dynacare Medical Laboratories*, A Division of the Gamma-Dynacare Laboratory Partnership, 245 Pall Mall Street, London, ONT, Canada N6A 1P4, 519–679–1630

Kroll Laboratory Specialists, Inc., 1111 Newton St., Gretna, LA 70053, 504–361–8989/800–433–3823 (Formerly: Laboratory Specialists, Inc.)

Kroll Laboratory Specialists, Inc., 450 Southlake Blvd., Richmond, VA 23236, 804–378–9130 (Formerly: Scientific Testing Laboratories, Inc.; Kroll Scientific Testing Laboratories, Inc.)

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 7207 N. Gessner Road, Houston, TX 77040, 713–856–8288/800–800–2387

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 69 First Ave., Raritan, NJ 08869, 908–526–2400/800–437–4986 (Formerly: Roche Biomedical Laboratories, Inc.)

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 1904 Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, 919–572–6900/800–833–3984 (Formerly: LabCorp Occupational Testing Services, Inc., CompuChem Laboratories, Inc.; CompuChem Laboratories, Inc., A Subsidiary of Roche Biomedical Laboratory; Roche CompuChem Laboratories, Inc., A Member of the Roche Group)

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 13112 Evening Creek Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92128, 858–668–3710/800–882–7272 (Formerly: Poisonlab, Inc.)

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 550 17th Ave., Suite 300, Seattle, WA 98122, 206–923–7020/800–898–0180 (Formerly: DrugProof, Division of Dynacare/Laboratory of Pathology, LLC; Laboratory of Pathology of Seattle, Inc.; DrugProof, Division of Laboratory of Pathology of Seattle, Inc.)

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 1120 Main Street, Southaven, MS 38671, 866–827–8042/800–233–6339 (Formerly: LabCorp Occupational Testing Services, Inc.; MedExpress/National Laboratory Center)

LabOne, Inc. d/b/a Quest Diagnostics, 10101 Renner Blvd., Lenexa, KS 66219, 913–888–3927/800–873–8845 (Formerly: Quest Diagnostics Incorporated; LabOne, Inc.; Center for Laboratory Services, a Division of LabOne, Inc.)

Marshfield Laboratories, Forensic Toxicology Laboratory, 1000 North Oak Ave., Marshfield, WI 54449, 715–389–3734/800–331–3734

MAXXAM Analytics Inc.*, 6740 Campobello Road, Mississauga, ON, Canada L5N 2L8, 905–817–5700 (Formerly: NOVAMANN (Ontario), Inc.)

MedTox Laboratories, Inc., 402 W. County Road D, St. Paul, MN 55112, 651–636–7466/800–832–3244

Meriter Laboratories, 36 South Brooks St., Madison, WI 53715, 608–267–6225 (Formerly: General Medical Laboratories)

MetroLab-Legacy Laboratory Services, 1225 NE 2nd Ave., Portland, OR 97232, 503–413–5295/800–950–5295

Minneapolis Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Forensic Toxicology Laboratory, 1 Veterans Drive, Minneapolis, MN 55417, 612–725–2088

National Toxicology Laboratories, Inc., 1100 California Ave., Bakersfield, CA 93304, 661–322–4250/800–350–3515

One Source Toxicology Laboratory, Inc., 1213 Genoa-Red Bluff, Pasadena, TX 77504, 888–747–3774 (Formerly: University of Texas Medical Branch, Clinical Chemistry Division; UTMB Pathology-Toxicology Laboratory)

Oregon Medical Laboratories, 123 International Way, Springfield, OR 97477, 541–341–8092

Pacific Toxicology Laboratories, 9348 DeSoto Ave., Chatsworth, CA 91311, 800–328–6942 (Formerly: Centinela Hospital Airport Toxicology Laboratory)

Pathology Associates Medical Laboratories, 110 West Cliff Dr.,

Spokane, WA 99204, 509–755–8991/800–541–7891x7
Physicians Reference Laboratory, 7800 West 110th St., Overland Park, KS 66210, 913–339–0372/800–821–3627
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, 3175 Presidential Dr., Atlanta, GA 30340, 770–452–1590/800–729–6432 (Formerly: SmithKline Beecham Clinical Laboratories; SmithKline Bio-Science Laboratories)
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, 400 Egypt Road, Norristown, PA 19403, 610–631–4600/877–642–2216, (Formerly: SmithKline Beecham Clinical Laboratories; SmithKline Bio-Science Laboratories)
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, 506 E. State Pkwy., Schaumburg, IL 60173, 800–669–6995/847–885–2010 (Formerly: SmithKline Beecham Clinical Laboratories; International Toxicology Laboratories)
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, 7600 Tyrone Ave., Van Nuys, CA 91405, 866–370–6699/818–989–2521, (Formerly: SmithKline Beecham Clinical Laboratories)
S.E.D. Medical Laboratories, 5601 Office Blvd., Albuquerque, NM 87109, 505–727–6300/800–999–5227
South Bend Medical Foundation, Inc., 530 N. Lafayette Blvd., South Bend, IN 46601, 574–234–4176 x276
Southwest Laboratories, 4645 E. Cotton Center Boulevard, Suite 177, Phoenix, AZ 85040, 602–438–8507/800–279–0027
Sparrow Health System, Toxicology Testing Center, St. Lawrence Campus, 1210 W. Saginaw, Lansing, MI 48915, 517–364–7400, (Formerly: St. Lawrence Hospital & Healthcare System)
St. Anthony Hospital Toxicology Laboratory, 1000 N. Lee St., Oklahoma City, OK 73101, 405–272–7052
Toxicology & Drug Monitoring Laboratory, University of Missouri Hospital & Clinics, 301 Business Loop 70 West, Suite 208, Columbia, MO 65203, 573–882–1273
Toxicology Testing Service, Inc., 5426 NW. 79th Ave., Miami, FL 33166, 305–593–2260
U.S. Army Forensic Toxicology Drug Testing Laboratory, 2490 Wilson St., Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755–5235, 301–677–7085

* The Standards Council of Canada (SCC) voted to end its Laboratory Accreditation Program for Substance Abuse (LAPSA) effective May 12, 1998. Laboratories certified through that program were accredited to conduct forensic urine drug testing as required by U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations. As of that date, the certification of those accredited Canadian laboratories will continue under DOT authority. The responsibility for conducting quarterly performance testing plus periodic on-site inspections of those LAPSA-accredited laboratories was transferred to the U.S. HHS, with the HHS' NLCP contractor continuing to have an active role in the performance testing and laboratory inspection processes. Other Canadian laboratories wishing to be considered for the NLCP may apply directly to the NLCP contractor just as U.S. laboratories do.

Upon finding a Canadian laboratory to be qualified, HHS will recommend that DOT certify the laboratory (**Federal Register**, July 16, 1996) as meeting the minimum standards of the Mandatory Guidelines published in the **Federal Register** on April 13, 2004 (69 FR 19644). After receiving DOT certification, the laboratory will be included in the monthly list of HHS-certified laboratories and participate in the NLCP certification maintenance program.

Dated: May 3, 2007.

Elaine Parry,

Acting Director, Office of Program Services, SAMHSA.

[FR Doc. E7–9087 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–20–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Office of the Secretary

Public Workshop: Privacy Impact Assessments at DHS—A Tutorial on How To Write PIAs for the Department of Homeland Security

AGENCY: Privacy Office, DHS.

ACTION: Notice announcing public workshop.

SUMMARY: The Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office will host a public workshop, ''Privacy Impact Assessments at DHS—A Tutorial on How to Write PIAs.''

DATES: The workshop will be held on May 23, 2007, from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held in the auditorium at the DHS Offices at the GSA Regional Headquarters Building located at 7th and D Streets, SW., Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brooke Dickson-Knowles, Privacy Office, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC 20528; by telephone 703–235–0780; by facsimile 703–235–0790; or by e-mail at *privacyworkshop@dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Privacy Office is holding a public workshop that will provide in-depth training on how to write privacy impact assessments (PIAs). A case study will be used to illustrate a step-by-step approach to researching, preparing, and writing these documents. The workshop will highlight the changes to the Privacy Impact Assessments: Official Guidance for DHS as well as refresh attendees on the content of a PIA at DHS.

The workshop is open to the public and there is no fee for attendance.

Registration and Security: In order to facilitate security requirements of the GSA facility, attendees must register in advance for this workshop. Registration closes at 9 a.m., Monday, May 21, 2007. To register, please send an e-mail to *privacyworkshop@dhs.gov,* with the name of the workshop in the subject line, and your full name and organizational affiliation in the body of the e-mail. Alternatively, you may call 703–235–0780 to register and to provide the Privacy Office with your full name and organizational affiliation.

All attendees who are employed by a federal agency will be required to show their federal agency employee photo identification badge to enter the building. Attendees who do not possess a federal agency employee photo identification badge will need to show a form of government-issued photo identification, such as a driver's license, in order to verify their previously-provided registration information. This is a security requirement of the facility.

The Privacy Office will only use your name for the security purposes of this specific workshop and to contact you in the event of a change to the workshop.

Special Assistance: Persons with disabilities who require special assistance should indicate this in their admittance request and are encouraged to identify anticipated special needs as early as possible.

Dated: April 27, 2007.

Hugo Teufel III,

Chief Privacy Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9058 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

[CGD08–07–011]

Houston/Galveston Navigation Safety Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: The Houston/Galveston Navigation Safety Advisory Committee (HOGANSAC) and its working groups will meet to discuss waterway improvements, aids to navigation, area projects impacting safety on the Houston Ship Channel, and various other navigation safety matters in the Galveston Bay area. All meetings will be open to the public.

DATES: The next meeting of HOGANSAC will be held on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 9 a.m. The meeting of the Committee's working groups will be held on Tuesday, May 8, 2007 at 9 a.m. Members of the public may present written or oral statements at either meeting. Requests to make oral presentations or distribute written materials should reach the Coast Guard five (5) working days before the meeting at which the presentation will be made. Requests to have written materials distributed to each member of the committee in advance of the meeting should reach the Coast Guard at least ten (10) working days before the meeting at which the presentation will be made.

ADDRESSES: The full Committee will be held at the Houston Pilots Association, 8150 South Loop East, Houston, Texas 7701–1747, (713) 645–9620. The working groups meeting will be held at the Foret Enterprises, Inc., 15201 East Freeway, Suite 109, Channelview, Texas 77530, (281) 452–9940. This notice is available on the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Commander Jerry Torok, Executive Secretary of HOGANSAC, telephone (713) 671–5164, or Lieutenant Jon Stewart, Assistant to the Executive Secretary of HOGANSAC, telephone (713) 678–9001, e-mail *jon.d.stewart@uscg.mil.* Written materials and requests to make presentations should be sent to Commanding Officer, Sector Houston/Galveston, Attn: LT Stewart, 9640 Clinton Drive, Houston, TX 77029.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of this meeting is given pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

Agendas of the Meetings

Houston/Galveston Navigation Safety Advisory Committee (HOGANSAC). The tentative agenda includes the following:

(1) Opening remarks by the Committee Sponsor (RADM Whitehead) or the Committee Sponsor's representative, Executive Director (CAPT Diehl) and Chairperson (Ms. Patricia Clark).

(2) Approval of the January 23, 2007 minutes.

(3) Old Business:

(a) Navigation Operations/Maritime Incident Review subcommittee report.

(b) Deep draft Entry Facilitation subcommittee report.

(c) Dredging subcommittee report.

(d) Technology subcommittee report.

(e) Area Maritime Security Committee Liaison's report.

(f) Harbor of Safe Refuge subcommittee report.

(g) HOGANSAC Outreach report.

(h) Maritime Awareness subcommittee report.

(4) New Business:

(a) Presentation of new HOGANSAC Charter—CDR Torok.

Working Groups Meeting. The tentative agenda for the working groups meeting includes the following:

(1) Review and discuss the work completed by each working group.

(2) Put forth any action items for consideration at full committee meeting.

Procedural. Working groups have been formed to examine the following issues: Dredging and related issues, electronic navigation systems, AtoN knockdowns, impact of passing vessels on moored ships, boater education issues, facilitating deep draft movements, mooring infrastructure, and safe refuge during hurricanes. Not all working groups will provide a report at this session. Further, working group reports may not necessarily include discussions on all issues within the particular working group's area of responsibility. All meetings are open to the public. Members of the public may make presentations, oral or written, at either meeting. Requests to make oral or written presentations should reach the Coast Guard five (5) working days before the meeting at which the presentation will be made. If you would like to have written materials distributed to each member of the committee in advance of the meeting, you should send your request along with fifteen (15) copies of the materials to the Coast Guard at least ten (10) working days before the meeting at which the presentation will be made.

Information on Services for the Handicapped: For information on facilities or services for the handicapped or to request special assistance at the meetings, contact the Executive Secretary or Assistant to the Executive Secretary as soon as possible.

Dated: April 26, 2007.

J.R. Whitehead,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. E7–9060 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

[USCG–2007–28120]

Towing Safety Advisory Committee; Notice of Open Teleconference Meeting

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a teleconference of the Towing Safety Advisory Committee (TSAC). The purpose of this teleconference is for TSAC to present its comments to the Coast Guard on certain draft regulatory text contemplated for the Notice of Proposed Rule Making for Towing Vessel Inspection currently under development.

DATES: The teleconference call will take place on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m. EDT. The meeting may adjourn early if all business is finished.

ADDRESSES: Members of the public may participate by coming to Room 6319, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on this notice, contact Mr. Gerald Miante, TSAC's Assistant Executive Director, telephone 202–372–1401, fax 202–372–1926, or e-mail *Gerald.P.Miante@uscg.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: TSAC advises, consults with, and makes recommendations to the Secretary DHS on matters relating to shallow-draft inland and coastal waterway navigation and towing safety. Notice of these meetings is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. (Pub. L. 92–463). Members of the public may also participate in this meeting by dialing 1–866–675–0373, pass code 8388087. Public participation is welcomed; however, the number of teleconference lines is limited and

available on a first-come, first-served basis.

Tentative Agenda

- Welcome and Opening Remarks—TSAC Chairman (11 a.m.).
- Discussion, presentation and voting of the Committee's recommendations to the Coast Guard on draft text for a Towing Vessel Inspection rulemaking.
- Public comment period (as time permits).
- Meeting adjourned—(1 p.m.).

Procedural

This meeting is open to the public. Please note that the meeting may adjourn early if all business is finished. At the Chair's discretion, members of the public may make oral presentations during the meeting. If you would like to make an oral presentation at the meeting, please notify Mr. Miante no later than May 17, 2007.

Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meetings, contact Mr. Miante as soon as possible.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

J.G. Lantz,

Director of National and International Standards, Assistant Commandant for Prevention.

[FR Doc. E7–9061 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of an Existing Information Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 30-day notice of information collection under review: Form I–102, application for replacement/initial nonimmigrant arrival-departure document; OMB Control No. 1615–0079.

The Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 5, 2007, at 72 FR 9769 allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received on this information collection.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 11, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Clearance Office, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20529. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202–272–8352 or via e-mail at *rfs.regs@dhs.gov*, and to the OMB USCIS Desk Officer via facsimile at 202–395–6974 or via e-mail at *kastrich@omb.eop.gov.*

When submitting comments by e-mail please make sure to add OMB Control Number 1615–0079 in the subject box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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 of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for Replacement/Initial Nonimmigrant Arrival-Departure Document.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I–102. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or households. This information collection will be used by an alien temporarily residing in the United States to request a replacement of his or her arrival evidence. The information provided can be used to verify status and for determination as to the eligibility of the applicant.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 12,195 responses at 25 minutes (.416 hours) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 5,073 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Suite 3008, Washington, DC 20529; Telephone 202–272–8377.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Richard Sloan,

Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E7–9124 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 30-day notice of information collection under review: Form I–1612, application for waiver of the foreign residence requirement of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; OMB Control No. 1615–0030.

The Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on February 27, 2007, at 72 FR 8763 allowing for a 60-day public

comment period. No comments were received on this information collection.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 11, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Clearance Office, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20529. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202–272–8352 or via e-mail at *rfs.regs@dhs.gov,* and to the OMB USCIS Desk Officer via facsimile at 202–395–6974 or via e-mail at *kastrich@omb.eop.gov.*

When submitting comments by e-mail please make sure to add OMB Control Number 1615–0030 in the subject box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for Waiver of the Foreign Residence Requirement of Section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I–612. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or households. This form is used by the USCIS to determine eligibility for a waiver.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 1,300 responses at 20 minutes (.333) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 433 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Suite 3008, Washington, DC 20529; Telephone 202–272–8377.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Richard Sloan,

Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E7–9125 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of an Existing Information Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 30-day notice of information collection under review: Form I–694, notice of appeal of decision under section 210 or 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act; OMB Control No. 1615–0034.

The Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 7, 2007, at 72 FR 10240 allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received on this information collection.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 11, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Clearance Office, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20529. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202–272–8352 or via e-mail at *rfs.regs@dhs.gov,* and to the OMB USCIS Desk Officer via facsimile at 202–395–6974 or via e-mail at *kastrich@omb.eop.gov.*

When submitting comments by e-mail please make sure to add OMB Control Number 1615–0034 in the subject box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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 of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Notice of Appeal of Decision Under Section 210 or 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I–694. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or households. This information collection will be used by USCIS in considering

appeals of denials or termination of temporary and permanent residence status by legalization applicants and special agricultural workers, under sections 210 and 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and related applications for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 1,192 respondents at 30 Minutes (.50) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 596 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Suite 3008, Washington, DC 20529; Telephone 202–272–8377.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Richard Sloan,

Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E7–9126 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of an Existing Information Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 30-Day notice of information collection under review: Form I–777, application for issuance or replacement of Northern Mariana Card; OMB Control No. 1615–0042.

The Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 5, 2007, at 72 FR 9769 allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received on this information collection.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 11, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Clearance Office, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20529. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202–272–8352 or via e-mail at *rfs.regs@dhs.gov,* and to the OMB USCIS Desk Officer via facsimile at 202–395–6974 or via e-mail at *kastrich@omb.eop.gov.*

When submitting comments by e-mail please make sure to add OMB Control Number 1615–0042 in the subject box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for Issuance or Replacement of Northern Mariana Card.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I–777. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or Households. This information collection is used by applicants to apply for a Northern Mariana identification card if they received United States citizenship pursuant to Public Law 94–241 (Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 100 responses annually at 30 minutes (.50) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 50 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Suite 3008, Washington, DC 20529; Telephone 202–272–8377.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Richard Sloan,

Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E7–9127 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5124–C–06]

Corrected Notice of Submission of Proposed Information Collection to OMB; LOCCS Voice Response System Payment Vouchers for Public and Indian Housing Programs

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Notice, correction.

SUMMARY: This notice was previously published on March 1, 2007 and is being republished to extend the comment period until May 31, 2007. The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

HUD is requesting extension of OMB approval for the application for grant funds disbursement through the LOCCS Voice Response System.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB approval Number (2577–0166) and should be sent to: Aneita Waites,

Reports Liaison Officer, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, Room 4116, Washington, DC 20401–5000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Aneita Waites, Reports Liaison Officer, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 4116, Washington, DC 20410–5000; e-mail *Aneita_L._Waites@HUD.gov*; telephone (202) 402–4114. This is not a toll-free number. Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Waites and at HUD's Web site at *http://www5.hud.gov.63001/po/i/icbts/collectionsearch.cfm.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 1, 2007 (72 FR 9347), this notice informed the public that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will be submitting the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended). This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affecting agencies the proposed collection of information: (1) 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; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and charity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appriate automaetd collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses. Accordingly, FR Doc. E7–3610, published on March 1, 2007 (72 FR 9348), is being republished to extend the comment period until May 31, 2007.

This Notice Also Lists the Following Information

Title of Proposal: LOCCS Voice Response System Payment Vouchers for Public and Indian Housing Programs.

OMB Approval Number: 2577–0166.

Form Numbers: HUD–50080 series.

Description of the Need for the Information and its Proposed Use: Grant recipients use the applicable payment information to request funds from HUD through the LOCCS/VRS voice activated system. The information collected on the payment voucher will also be used as an internal control measure to ensure the lawful and appropriate disbursement of Federal funds as well as provide a service to program recipients.

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

	Number of respondents	Annual responses	×	Hours per response	=	Burden hours
Reporting burden	4,746	114,113		0.15		17,117

Total estimated burden hours: 17,117.

Status: Request for extension of an existing information collection.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 35, as amended.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Bessy Kong,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy, Program and Legislative Initiatives.

[FR Doc. 07–2320 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–07–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5124–N–07]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment; Exigent Health and Safety Deficiency Correction Certification

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: *Comments due date:* July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name/or OMB Control number and should be sent to: Aneita Waites, Reports Liaison Officer, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 4116, Washington, DC 20410–5000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Aneita Waites, (202) 708–0713, extension 4114, for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents. (This is not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended). This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) 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; (2) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Exigent Health and Safety Deficiency Correction Certification.

OMB Control Number: 2577–0241.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: HUD's Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) regulation (24 CFR part 5, subpart G) provides that HUD housing must be decent, safe, sanitary, and in good repair. Public housing agencies (PHAs) must maintain housing in a manner that meets prescribed physical condition standards to be considered decent, safe, sanitary, and in good repair. The UPCS regulation also provides that all area and components of the housing must be free of health and safety hazards. HUD conducts physical inspections of the HUD-funded housing to determine if the UPCS standards are being met. Pursuant to the UPCS inspection protocol, at the end of the inspection (or at the end of each day of a multi-day inspection) the inspector provides the property representative

with a copy of the ''Notification of Exigent and Fire Safety Hazards Observed'' form. Each exigent health and safety (EHS) deficiency that the inspector observed that day is listed on the form. The property representative signs the form acknowledging receipt. PHAs are to correct EHS deficiencies (i.e., emergency work orders) within 24 hours. PHAs are to notify HUD, using the electronic format, within three business days of the date of inspection, which is the date the PHA was provided notice of these deficiencies, that the deficiencies were corrected within the prescribed time frames.

Agency form number: None.

Members of affected public: Public Housing Agencies.

Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents: 1,166 respondents annually with one response per respondent. Average time per response is .42 hours and the total burden hours are 491.13.

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of currently approved collection.

Authority: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Bessy Kong,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy, Program and Legislative Initiatives.

[FR Doc. E7–9059 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4912–N–24]

Notice of Availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Westpark Master Plan Redevelopment Project, City of Bremerton, WA

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: HUD gives this notice to the public, agencies and Indian Tribes on the availability for public review of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the redevelopment of the Westpark public housing community in Bremerton, WA. HUD gives this notice on behalf of the City of Bremerton acting as the Responsible Entity for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 24 CFR 58.4, and jointly the Bremerton Housing Authority (BHA) acting as lead agency for compliance with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The NEPA/SEPA Final EIS will be available for a 30-day period beginning today. A NEPA Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued after the 30-day availability period. This notice is in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations at 40 CFR parts 1500–1508.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* Comments must be received 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Comments are to be submitted to Andrea Spencer at the address below or *Andrea.Spencer@ci.bremerton.wa.us*.

ADDRESSES: The Final EIS is available on the internet and can be viewed or downloaded at *http://www.ci.bremerton.wa.us*; or *http://www.newwestpark.com*. Hard copies are available for the cost of reproduction. The Final EIS can also be reviewed at the City of Bremerton Community Development Department, 345 6th Street, Suite 600, Bremerton, WA; Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Bremerton Housing Authority, 345 6th Street, Suite 200, Bremerton, WA; and at the following public libraries:

Downtown Bremerton Library (612 5th Street, Bremerton).

Sylvan Way Library (1301 Sylvan Way, Bremerton).

Silverdale Library (3450 NW Carlton, Silverdale).

Port Orchard Library (87 Sidney Street, Port Orchard).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrea Spencer, City of Bremerton Department of Community Development, 345 6th Street, Suite 600, Bremerton, WA 98337–1873; telephone (360) 473–5283; fax (360) 473–5278; and e-mail *Andrea.Spencer@ci.bremerton.wa.us*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Westpark public housing development was originally constructed in the early 1940's to provide temporary homes for defense workers and their families during World War II. The 82-acre site is located in West Bremerton, and is bounded by Kitsap Way on the north, Oyster Bay Road on the east, and State Route 3 on the west. There are currently 631 public housing units on the site, a community center and other community facilities. The existing site is physically isolated and physically deteriorated, and in 2003 it was designated as ''blighted'' by the City of Bremerton for purposes of community renewal efforts pursuant to the state Community Renewal Law (Chapter 35.81 Revised Code of Washington).

The Westpark Redevelopment, sponsored by the Bremerton Housing Authority, would demolish all existing housing structures and infrastructure and redevelop the site as a mixed-use, mixed-income, pedestrian oriented, master planned community. It would contain approximately 759 housing units; 60,000 square feet of commercial uses in a 5-acre village center and in mixed-use buildings; and 28 acres of parks and open space. New housing would be for sale and for rent, single family and multi-family, and would incorporate low income, affordable and market rate units to meet a variety of housing needs. All existing public housing units will be replaced either on-site (190 units) or off-site (441), at locations in the City and Kitsap County; no net loss of low income housing units would occur. The project will require relocation of all existing residents. Alternatives considered in the EIS include No Action (involving no redevelopment) and a Design Alternative (with a larger retail area, the same number of housing units, and additional stormwater controls).

Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading of **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: May 4, 2007.

Pamela H. Patenaude,

Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

[FR Doc. E7–9065 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5125–N–19]

Federal Property Suitable as Facilities to Assist the Homeless

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathy Ezzell, room 7266, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708–1234; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708–2565 (these

telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1–800–927–7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 24 CFR part 581 and section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), as amended, HUD is publishing this Notice to identify Federal buildings and other real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. The properties were reviewed using information provided to HUD by Federal landholding agencies regarding unutilized and underutilized buildings and real property controlled by such agencies or by GSA regarding its inventory of excess or surplus Federal property. This Notice is also published in order to comply with the December 12, 1988 Court Order in *National Coalition for the Homeless* v. *Veterans Administration,* No. 88–2503–OG (D.D.C.).

Properties reviewed are listed in this Notice according to the following categories: Suitable/available, suitable/unavailable, suitable/to be excess, and unsuitable. The properties listed in the three suitable categories have been reviewed by the landholding agencies, and each agency has transmitted to HUD: (1) Its intention to make the property available for use to assist the homeless, (2) its intention to declare the property excess to the agency's needs, or (3) a statement of the reasons that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use as facilities to assist the homeless.

Properties listed as suitable/available will be available exclusively for homeless use for a period of 60 days from the date of this Notice. Where property is described as for ''off-site use only'' recipients of the property will be required to relocate the building to their own site at their own expense. Homeless assistance providers interested in any such property should send a written expression of interest to HHS, addressed to John Hicks, Division of Property Management, Program Support Center, HHS, room 5B–17, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857; (301) 443–2265. (This is not a toll-free number.) HHS will mail to the interested provider an application packet, which will include instructions for completing the application. In order to maximize the opportunity to utilize a suitable property, providers should submit their written expressions of interest as soon as possible. For complete details concerning the processing of applications, the reader is encouraged to refer to the interim rule governing this program, 24 CFR part 581.

For properties listed as suitable/to be excess, that property may, if subsequently accepted as excess by GSA, be made available for use by the homeless in accordance with applicable law, subject to screening for other Federal use. At the appropriate time, HUD will publish the property in a Notice showing it as either suitable/available or suitable/unavailable.

For properties listed as suitable/unavailable, the landholding agency has decided that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use to assist the homeless, and the property will not be available.

Properties listed as unsuitable will not be made available for any other purpose for 20 days from the date of this Notice. Homeless assistance providers interested in a review by HUD of the determination of unsuitability should call the toll free information line at 1–800–927–7588 for detailed instructions or write a letter to Mark Johnston at the address listed at the beginning of this Notice. Included in the request for review should be the property address (including zip code), the date of publication in the **Federal Register**, the landholding agency, and the property number.

For more information regarding particular properties identified in this Notice (*i.e.*, acreage, floor plan, existing sanitary facilities, exact street address), providers should contact the appropriate landholding agencies at the following addresses: ARMY: Ms. Veronica Rines, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Attn: DAIM–ZS, Room 8536, 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA 22202; (703) 601–2545; (These are not toll-free numbers).

Dated: May 3, 2007.

Mark R. Johnston,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs.

TITLE V, FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM FEDERAL REGISTER REPORT FOR 05/11/2007

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

Alaska

Bldg. 00001
Holy Cross Armory
High Cross AK 99602
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710051
Status: Excess
Comments: 1200 sq. ft. armory, off-site use only

California

Bldg. 00119
Fort Hunter Liggett
Monterey CA 93930
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710052
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 4340 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Bldgs. 00295, 00573
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710054
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Baseball fields, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 00576, 00577
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710056
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1968/2400 sq. ft., most recent use—youth shelter, possible asbestos, off-site use only

Bldg. 00578
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710057
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 851 sq. ft., most recent use—recreation shelter, off-site use only

Bldg. 00597
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710058
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 881 sq. ft., most recent use—snack bar, off-site use only

Bldg. 00598
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710059
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 960 sq. ft., most recent use—recreation shelter, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 00732, 00733, 00734
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710060
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 360 sq. ft., most recent use—bus shelters, off-site use only

14 Bldgs
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710061
Status: Unutilized
Directions: 00827, 00829, 00831, 00833, 00835, 00837, 00839, 00841, 00843, 00845, 00847, 00849, 00851, 00853
Comments: Basketball courts, off-site use only

Bldg. 07000
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710062
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 5956 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—four family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 07001
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710063
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 945 sq. ft., most recent use—carport, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 07010, 07020
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710064
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 10256 sq. ft. ea., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07011, 07021
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710065
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1680 sq. ft. each, most recent use—carports, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07030, 07040
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710066
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 12,820 sq. ft. each, possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—10 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07031, 07041, 07042
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710067
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 2058/1302/945 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 07050, 07060, 07070
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710068
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 10256 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling units, off-site use only

4 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 07051, 07061, 07062, 07071
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710069
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1680/945 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07080, 07100, 07120
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710070
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 5956 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—4 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

7 Bldgs.
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710071
Status: Unutilized
Directions: 07081, 07091, 07101, 07111, 07121, 07131, 07141
Comments: 1302 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710072
Status: Unutilized
Directions: 07130, 07140, 07150, 07160
Comments: 10256 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

Bldg. 07090
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710073
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 12820 sq. ft., most recent use—10 family dwelling unit, possible asbestos/lead paint, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 07142, 07152, 07161, 07191, 07201
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710074
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 945 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

6 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 07151, 07171, 07181, 07202, 07211, 07221
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710075
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1302 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07110, 07170
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710076
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 7692/8520 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 07190, 07200, 07210, 07230, 07240
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710077
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 10256 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

4 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 07231, 07251, 07261, 07271
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710078
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1680 sq. ft., most recent use—carports, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07260, 07280
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710079
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 10256 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 07220, 07290
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710080
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 7692 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

Bldg. 07241
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710081
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 2058 sq. ft., most recent use—carport, off-site use only

Bldg. 07250
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710082
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 11804 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, offsite use only

Bldg. 07270
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710083
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 12820 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—10 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldg. 07281
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710084
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 945 sq. ft., most recent use—carport, off-site use only

Bldgs. 07282, 07291
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710085
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1302 sq. ft., most recent use—carport, off-site use only

Bldgs. 08000, 08010
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710086
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3708 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—2 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08020
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710088
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 9579 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldg. 08030
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710089
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 16264 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 08040, 08050, 08060, 08070, 08080
Santa Clara CA 94036
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710090
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08090
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710091
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3780 sq. ft., possible abestos/lead paint, most recent use—2 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldg. 08130
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710092
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 7084 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—4 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 08100, 08110, 08120, 08140, 08150
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710093
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

4 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 08160, 08170, 08180, 08190
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710094
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

5 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 08200, 08210, 08220, 08230, 08240
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710095
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08250
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710096
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3624 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, 2 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08260
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710097
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8461 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—5 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08280
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710098
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 5337 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—3 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

Bldgs. 08300, 08320, 08340
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710099
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 9579 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldgs. 08380, 08400
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710100
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 17199 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—12 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldg. 08440
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710101
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 12961 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—8 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Bldgs. 08420, 08460, 08480
Moffett Field
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710102
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

California

6 Bldgs.
Moffett Field 08500, 08520, 08540, 08560, 08580, 08600
Santa Clara CA 94035
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710103
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 8710 sq. ft., possible asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—6 family dwelling unit, off-site use only

Colorado

Bldg. 01516
Fort Carson
El Paso CO 80913
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640116
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 723 sq. ft., needs repair, most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Georgia

Bldg. 07783
Fort Stewart
Hinesville GA 31314
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640093
Status: Excess
Comments: 8640 sq. ft., most recent use—maintenance hangar, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

Georgia

Bldg. 08061
Fort Stewart
Hinesville GA 31314
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640094
Status: Excess
Comments: 1296 sq. ft., most recent use—weather station, off-site use only

Oklahoma

Bldgs. 00937, 00957
Fort Sill
Lawton OK 73501
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710104
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1558 sq. ft., most recent use—storage shed, off-site use only

Bldg. 01514
Fort Sill
Lawton OK 73501
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200710105
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1602 sq. ft., most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

Texas

Bldg. 07008
Fort Hood
Ft. Hood Co: Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640097
Status: Excess
Comments: 288 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—equipment bldg., off-site use only

Bldg. 90036
Fort Hood
Ft. Hood Co: Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640098
Status: Excess
Comments: 13,124 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—admin., off-site use only

Bldg. 90037
Fort Hood
Ft. Hood Co: Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640099
Status: Excess
Comments: 13,124 sq. ft., pressence of asbestos, most recent use—admin., off-site use only

Bldg. 90139
Fort Hood
Ft. Hood Co: Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640100
Status: Excess
Comments: 800 sq. ft., most recent use—oil storage, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

Texas

Bldg. 92039
Fort Hood
Ft. Hood Co: Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640101
Status: Excess
Comments: 80 sq. ft., most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Bldgs. 90137, 90138
Fort Hood
Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640121
Status: Excess
Comments: 16,800 sq. ft., most recent use—admin/shop, off-site use only

Wisconsin

Bldg. 02132
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640102
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 9000 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—commissary, off-site use only

Bldg. 00445
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640122
Status: Excess
Comments: 2700 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Suitable/Available Properties

Building

Wisconsin

Bldg. 00856
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640123
Status: Excess
Comments: 2500 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Bldg. 01253
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640124
Status: Excess
Comments: 1750 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—storage, off-site use only

Land

Maryland

2 acres
Fort Meade
Odenton Rd/Rt 175
Ft. Meade MD 20755
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640095
Status: Unutilized
Comments: light industrial

Suitable/Available Properties

Land

Maryland

16 acres
Fort Meade
Rt 198/Airport Road
Ft. Meade MD 20755
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640096
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Light industrial

Summary for Suitable/Available Properties

= Total number of Properties 164

Suitable/Unavailable Properties

Building

Texas

Bldg. 09504
Fort Hood
Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640117
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 120 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—oil storage off-site use only

Bldg. 56303
Fort Hood
Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640118
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 2750 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—equipment bldg., off-site use only

Suitable/Unavailable Properties

Building

Texas

Bldg. 56325
Fort Hood
Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640119
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 2100 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—fire station, off-site use only

Bldg. 56326
Fort Hood
Bell TX 76544
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640120
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3120 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—fire station, off-site use only

Wisconsin

Bldg. 05030
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640103
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1536 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—housing, off-site use only

Bldg. 05032
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640104
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 576 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—garage, off-site use only

Suitable/Unavailable Properties

Building

Wisconsin

Bldg. 06181
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640105
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 1823 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—housing, off-site use only

Bldg. 06188
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640106
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3416 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—housing, off-site use only

Bldg. 07051
Fort McCoy
Monroe WI 54656
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21200640107
Status: Unutilized
Comments: 3412 sq. ft., presence of asbestos/lead paint, most recent use—housing, off-site use only

Summary for Suitable/Unavailable Properties

= Total number of Properties 9

[FR Doc. E7–8820 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee Establishment: United States Geological Survey—Climate Change Science Program Committee for Synthesis and Assessment Product 1.2: Past Climate Variability and Change in the Arctic and at High Latitudes

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey, Interior.

ACTION: Establishment of a Federal Advisory Committee

SUMMARY: This notice is published in accordance with Section 9(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (Pub. L. 92–463). Following consultation with the General Services Administration, notice is hereby given that the Secretary of the Interior has established the U.S. Geological Survey—Climate Change Science Program Committee for Synthesis and Assessment Product 1.2: Past Climate Variability and Change in the Arctic and at High Latitudes.

The Climate Change Science Program (CCSP), a consortium of Federal agencies performing climate science, has established a synthesis and assessment (S&A) program as a part of its Strategic Plan. There are 21 S&A products to be administered by 13 Federal agencies over a 5-year period. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), a participant in the CCSP, is responsible for three S&A products. S&A product 1.2: Past Climate Variability and Change in the Arctic and at High Latitudes is the subject of this proposed Federal Advisory Committee.

The primary function of the Committee is to synthesize and assess the state of knowledge on past climate variability at high latitudes and communicate this information to the USGS. Committee members will meet and discuss issues relating to the study design, research methodology, data sources and quality, and study findings. The Committee will draft a report that will serve as the CCSP definitive document on current knowledge pertaining to the topic of past climate variability at high latitudes. Membership will consist of non-Federal scientists who are recognized as experts in the climate science community.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joan J. Fitzpatrick, U.S. Geological Survey, Box 25046, Denver Federal Center, MS–980, Denver, Colorado 80225–0046 (Phone Number: 303–236–7881).

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Dirk Kempthorne,

Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 07–2326 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4311–AM–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee Establishment: Climate Change Science Program Committee for Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.2: Thresholds of Climate Change

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Estaablishment of a Federal Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: This notice is published in accordance with Section 9(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (Pub. L. 92–643). Following consultation with the General Services Administration, notice is hereby given that the Secretary of the Interior has established the Advisory Committee for the United States Geological Survey—Climate Change Science Program for Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.2—Thresholds of Climate Change. The Climate Change Science Program (CCSP), a consortium of Federal agencies performing climate science, has established a synthesis and assessment (S&A) program as a part of its Strategic Plan. There are 21 S&A products to be administered by 13 Federal agencies over a 5-year period. The U.S. Geological Survey, a participant in the CCSP, is responsible for three S&A products. S&A product 4.2: Thresholds of Climate Change is the subject of this Federal Advisory Committee.

The primary function of the Committee is to synthesize and assess the state of knowledge on the topic of thresholds of climate change and communicate this information to the U.S. Geological Survey. Committee members will meet and discuss issues relating to the study design, research methodology, data sources and quality, and study findings. The Committee will draft a report that will serve as the CCSP definitive document on current knowledge pertaining to the topic of thresholds of climate change. Membership will consist of Federal and non-Federal scientists who are recognized as experts in the climate science community.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Colleen W. Charles, U.S. Geological Survey, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 301, Reston, Virginia 20192; 703–648–4110. *colleen_charles@usgs.gov.*

Dated: May 1, 2007.

Dick Kempthorne,

Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 07–2327 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4311–AM–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Notice of Cancellation of Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Program Office, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice; FACA Committee Meeting Cancellation Announcement.

SUMMARY: At the May 1, 2007 meeting of the Department's Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Advisory Committee, the Committee reached closure on the final report, which contains the Committee's recommendations to the Department. Therefore, because the Committee has completed its work, as noted in the April 16, 2007 **Federal Register** Notice (Vol. 72, No. 72, page 19014), there will be no need for the Committee to meet on May 15–17 in Lakewood, Colorado.

Document Availability: The Committee and the public can find helpful background information at the Restoration Program Web site *http://*

restoration.doi.gov. Minutes from prior Committee meetings, subcommittee reports and presentations, reference materials, and the Committee report are all available online at *http://restoration.doi.gov/faca*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Glomb, U.S. Department of the Interior, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Program, Mail Stop MIB 4449, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240; phone 202–208–4863; fax 202–208–2681; or *steve_glomb@ios.doi.gov*

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Frank M. DeLuise,

Designated Federal Officer, DOI Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. E7–9118 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Geological Survey

National Earthquake Prediction Evaluation Council

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Public Law 96–472, the National Earthquake Evaluation Council (NEPEC) will hold a 1-day workshop on May 18, 2007, and a short meeting on May 19, 2007. The workshop will be held at the Portland State Office Building, 1st Floor, Room 1D, 800 NE Oregon Street, Lloyd District, Portland, Oregon. On May 19, the short meeting will be held at the Double Tree Hotel, Lloyd Center, 1000 NE Multnomah, Portland, Oregon. The Committee is comprised of members from academia and the Federal Government. The Committee shall advise the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) on proposed earthquake predictions, on the completeness and scientific validity of the available data related to earthquake predictions, and on related matters as assigned by the Director.

At the 1-day workshop on May 18, the Committee will discuss with scientific experts the evidence for and nature of episodic nonvolcanic tremor and aseismic creep events and their possible relation to seismic slip on the Cascadia subduction interface and will discuss with emergency managers how the aseismic slip events and other earthquake-related phenomena in Cascadia should be communicated to the public. At the meeting on May 19, the Committee will review the workshop findings and compose recommendations to the USGS on what type of public information might be most appropriate and effective when episodic tremor and creep events are detected, and the Committee will receive brief updates on previous discussion topics.

Workshops and meetings of the National Earthquake Prediction Evaluation Council are open to the public. A draft workshop agenda is available on request (contact information below). In order to ensure sufficient seating and hand-outs, it is requested that visitors pre-register by May 11. Members of the public wishing to make a statement to the Committee should state that intentions so that time may be allotted in the agenda.

DATES: May 18, 2007, commencing at 8:30 a.m. and adjourning at 5 p.m., and May 19, 2007, commencing at 8 a.m. and adjourning at noon.

Contact: Dr. Michael Blanpied, Executive Secretary, National Earthquake Prediction Evaluation Council, U.S. Geological Survey, MS 905, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, Virginia 20192, (703) 648–6696, *mblanpied@usgs.gov.*

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Linda Gundersen,

Acting Associated Director for Geology.

[FR Doc. 07–2357 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4311–AM–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[OMB Number 1117–0023]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 60 day emergency notice of information collection under review import/export declaration for list i and list ii chemicals DEA form 486.

The Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with emergency review procedures of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. If granted, the emergency approval is only valid for 180 days. Comments should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 10 days until May 21, 2007.

If you have comments, especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Mark W. Caverly, Chief, Liaison and Policy Section, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537.

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 agencies 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 of a Currently Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Import/Export Declaration for List I and List II Chemicals.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:*

Form number: DEA Form 486.

Component: Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Business or other for-profit.

Other: None.

Abstract: Persons importing, exporting, and conducting international transactions with List I and List II chemicals must notify DEA of those transactions in advance of their

occurrence, including information regarding the person(s) to whom the chemical will be transferred and the quantity to be transferred. For importations, persons must also provide return declarations, confirming the date of the importation and transfer, and the amounts of the chemical transferred. This information is used to prevent shipments not intended for legitimate purposes.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* A respondent may submit multiple responses. The below table presents information regarding the number of respondents, responses, and associated burden hours.

	Number of respondents	Number of responses	Average time per response	Total (hours)
Form 486 (export)	239	7,995	0.2 hour (12 minutes)	1,599
Form 486 (Export Return Declaration)	239	7,995	0.08 hour (5 minutes)	666.25
Form 486 (import)	230	2,398	0.25 hour (15 minutes)	599.5
Form 486 (import return declaration)*	230	2,638	0.08 hour (5 minutes)	219.8
Form 486 (international transaction)	9	111	0.2 hour (12 minutes)	22.2
Form 486 (international transaction return declaration).	9	111	0.08 hour (5 minutes)	9.25
Quarterly reports for imports of acetone, 2-butanone, and toluene.	110	440	0.5 hour (30 minutes)	220
Total	239			3,555.8

*DEA assumes 10% of all imports will not be transferred in the first thirty days and will necessitate submission of a subsequent return declaration.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 3556 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E7–9139 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[OMB Number 1117–0031]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 60 day emergency notice of information collection under review. Application for registration under Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act of 1993 and renewal application for registration under Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act of 1993 DEA forms 510 & 510A.

The Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with emergency review procedures of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. If granted, the emergency approval is only valid for 180 days. Comments should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 10 days until May 21, 2007.

If you have comments, especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Mark W. Caverly, Chief, Liaison and Policy Section, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537.

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 agencies 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 of a Currently Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for Registration under Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act of 1993 and Renewal Application for Registration under Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act of 1993 DEA Forms 510 & 510A.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:*

Form number: DEA Forms 510 and 510a.

Component: Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Business or other for-profit. Other: none.

Abstract: The Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act requires that manufacturers, distributors, importers, and exporters of List I chemicals which may be diverted in the United States for the production of illicit drugs must register with DEA. Registration provides a system to aid in the tracking of the distribution of List I chemicals.

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: Respondents respond annually. The below table presents information regarding the number of respondents, responses, and associated burden hours.

	Respondents	Burden (minutes)	Total hour burden (hours)
DEA–510 (paper)	286	0.5 hours (30 minutes)	143
DEA–510 (electronic)	278	0.25 hours (15 minutes)	69.5
DEA–510a (paper)	644	0.5 hours (30 minutes)	322
DEA–510a (electronic)	1368	0.25 hours (15 minutes)	342
Total	2576		876.5

Total percentage electronic: 64%.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 877 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E7–9140 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

[OMB Number 1121–0234]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 30-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Extension of a currently approved collection for Requirements Data Collection Application for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP) 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. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 72, Number 44, page 10259 on March 7, 2007, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until June 11, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

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 the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395–5806. 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 agencies 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 of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Requirements Data Collection Application for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The Office of Management and Budget Number for this collection is 1121–0234. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice is sponsoring the collection.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State, Local or Tribal Government. The House of Representatives passed the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) Act in 1997 under Title III of H.R. 3. Congress first funded the program through an appropriations act in fiscal year 1998 and authorized the Attorney General to provide grants under the JAIBG program for states and units of local government, to include tribal governments. They were to use these funds to support innovative, effective programs that reduce juvenile offending through accountability-based initiatives focusing on offenders and the juvenile justice system and that improve the efficiency of state juvenile justice systems. The Department of Justice Authorization Act of FY 2003 included provisions to change the name of the JAIBG program to the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program, expand the number and scope of the program areas, refine the program's reporting and monitoring requirements, and include program funding as part of Title I (Part R, Chapter 46, Subchapter XII–F) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. This legislation stated that the changes would go into effect as of FY 2004.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* It is estimated that it will take 56 respondents an estimated 1 hour to respond to the application.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total estimated annual burden hours to complete the application is 4,200 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E7–9146 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Disability Employment Policy

[SGA 07–09]

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition and Employment for Youth With Disabilities; Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement

Announcement Type: New notice of Availability of Funds and Solicitation for Grant Application (SGA) for cooperative agreement.

Funding Opportunity Number: SGA 07–09.

Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 17.720.

DATES: Key Date: Applications must be received by June 25, 2007.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Labor (''DOL'' or ''Department''), Office of Disability Employment Policy (''ODEP''), announces the availability of up to $1.7 million to fund a cooperative agreement to establish the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition and Employment for Youth with Disabilities with a 24-month period of performance. In addition, this initiative may be funded for up to three (3) additional option years at approximately $1,000,000 per year, depending on performance, identified need and the availability of future funding.

Over the last 10 years, a number of federal and state efforts to improve access to transition planning and services to improve education, employment, and community living outcomes for youth with disabilities have emerged. As a result, there has been some improvement in indicators relevant to the successful transition of youth with disabilities, including increases in graduation rates, increases in enrollment in postsecondary education, and increases in the number of youth entering the workforce. While this progress is encouraging, education and employment outcomes for youth with disabilities continue to lag substantially behind that of their peers without disabilities.

To address this situation, ODEP is funding a national technical assistance center to build capacity within and across both generic and disability-specific youth service delivery systems to help youth with disabilities successfully transition from high school to post-secondary education and/or employment in high-demand career areas. Effectively addressing the complex and significant barriers to employment faced by youth with disabilities transitioning into the adult world requires the use of multiple strategies and the active involvement of many stakeholders, including Federal, State and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and employers.

This Center will conduct research, disseminate information, and provide technical assistance to a wide range of stakeholders on topics relevant to improving post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities including, but not limited to:

- Effective practices, such as the emerging use of individual learning or graduation plans, for aligning and improving the education and workforce development systems to better meet employer demand;
- Innovative service strategies which workforce development, and secondary and postsecondary programs and systems can utilize to better meet the needs of transitioning youth;
- Professional development strategies for practitioners who work with youth; and
- Effective models of multi-disciplinary interagency collaboration and systems coordination needed to support youth in achieving positive post-school outcomes through comprehensive service delivery consistent with the *Guideposts for Success,* see *http://www.dol.gov/odep/categories/youth/.* The *Guideposts for Success* serves as a conceptual framework on improving transition outcomes for youth with disabilities.

I. Funding Opportunity Description

1. Description and Purpose

ODEP will award one cooperative agreement to establish a national technical assistance and research center. The center will: (1) Conduct research to identify, validate and document effective practices and policies; (2) disseminate information; (3) provide technical assistance; (4) encourage collaboration; and (5) work with states and localities on multiple strategies for improving the post-school outcomes or youth with disabilities. The overall purpose of this effort is to build the capacity of workforce development, economic development, and educational service delivery systems and their partners to work together strategically to ensure that youth with disabilities graduate from high school and enter employment and/or further post-secondary education and training with the skills needed to meet employer demand in the 21st century workplace, and to maximize their ability to be self-sufficient and to live independently.

The Center's research related activities will improve systems capacity to provide comprehensive transition services utilizing research-based strategies consistent with the *Guideposts for Success.* It must include, but is not limited to, the following activities:

(a) Conducting an analysis of all states currently implementing individual learning/graduation planning strategies for all youth to identify practices and strategies that support positive outcomes or create barriers for youth with disabilities.

(b) Identifying effective practices for coordinating education, career preparation, youth development and leadership, health, and other employment-related support services that improve transition outcomes for youth with disabilities. The Center must consult with other appropriate technical assistance providers within the Departments of Labor, Education, Health and Human Services, and other Federal agencies in this effort.

(c) Assessing the impact of implementing a comprehensive professional development strategy on both the job retention of youth service practitioners and youth service outcomes.

(d) The identification of curricula, instructional approaches, programs, and policies that are potentially effective for improving both the academic and functional workplace skills of adolescents and young adults with disabilities.

The Center's technical assistance and dissemination activities must include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Assisting interested national, state and local entities in the creation of a professional development system for youth service practitioners;
- Promoting youth-centered planning and youth development and leadership opportunities;
- Producing reports and documents on trends, patterns, and legislation relating to secondary and post-secondary transition interventions, strategies, and supports and other pertinent topics as requested by ODEP;
- Preparing and disseminating reports and documents in publications including peer-reviewed journals;
- Providing information to educate relevant stakeholders, including state and local policymakers, educators, systems personnel, as well as youth and families, about changes in policy and practice needed in order to increase employment opportunities and wages for young people with disabilities;
- Providing information to educate employers and the general public about the abilities of youth with disabilities to work in a wide variety of occupations and about the use of accommodations;
- Providing technical assistance, training, and information that integrates evidence-based effective practices for improving transition results for young people with disabilities enrolled in Workforce Investment Act (WIA)-funded youth programs;
- Providing technical assistance, training, and information to increase understanding by youth service providers about disability related employment issues such as health care, transportation, work incentive provisions, benefits planning, housing, etc.;
- Providing technical assistance, training, and information to ODEP's current and future grantees. This includes serving as a repository and dissemination center for the materials and effective practices developed by ODEP grantees; and
- Creating and maintaining a user-friendly Web site with relevant information and documents in a form that meets a government or industry-recognized standard for accessibility.

The Center's collaboration activities must include, but are not limited to:

- Promoting high quality interagency collaboration and service coordination between and among Federal, State, and local agencies with a focus on identifying, developing, and implementing interagency service strategies that effectively maximize available resources; and
- Developing and maintaining relationships that encourage collaboration to foster integrated approaches to transition planning and services. Partners are not limited to, but may include the following entities:

(1) State departments of Labor, Health, Education, Vocational Rehabilitation and Economic Development, Governors' Committees on Employment of People with Disabilities, State Councils for Independent Living, Mental Health Agencies, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disability Councils, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Agencies;

(2) Local WIA youth services providers, Job Corps representatives, foster care and juvenile justice agencies, public housing, health and transportation authorities, local One-Stop centers, community and faith-based organizations, and disability organizations, such as Centers for Independent Living;

(3) Employers and their professional networks such as Business Leadership Networks (BLNs), Chambers of Commerce, and other employer trade association;

(4) National education and youth development and leadership organizations;

(5) Federal agencies including the Departments of Education, Transportation and Health and Human Services, The Social Security Administration, The Corporation for National and Community Service and other agencies that work to improve access to public accommodations, commercial facilities, information technology, telecommunications services, and housing; and

(6) Other Federal technical assistance projects that provide information about transition, postsecondary education, employment, and independent living issues for young people with disabilities.

Additionally the Center will work to ensure that youth with disabilities are thoughtfully included in the emerging practice of individual learning/graduation plans (ILPs) for all youth currently being implemented in at least 20 states by:

(1) Conducting research during its first 6 months to analyze existing policies and practices and the impact they have on youth with disabilities;

(2) Providing targeted technical assistance including professional development support and training to a minimum of three (3) competitively selected states currently implementing individual learning/graduation planning strategies to ensure that the policies being developed and the practices being implemented are responsive to and inclusive of the needs of youth with disabilities; and

(3) Spending at least 6 months conducting a follow up evaluation of the impact of the targeted technical assistance described above. A goal of the effort will be to document emerging effective practices and increase the capacity of other localities implementing ILPs.

A minimum of $600,000 is to be spent on the above three components of the work plan relating to individual learning/graduation plans. Staff time and project resources dedicated to provide technical assistance to ODEP-specified states will be negotiated with ODEP as part of the cooperative agreement within thirty (30) days of the date of the award.

The remainder of the funding that is provided is to be spent on carrying out the general technical assistance functions described previously.

2. Background

The Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP) provides national leadership by developing and influencing disability-related employment policies and practices. A five-year strategic plan guides ODEP in achieving its mission by identifying long-term strategic and outcome goals as well as shorter-term intermediate and performance goals. In addition to measuring agency performance, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the strategic plan sets forth a road map for prioritizing the formulation and dissemination of innovative employment policies and practices to service delivery systems and employers.

ODEP's annual goal is to build knowledge and advance disability employment policy that affects and promotes systems change. The agency's long- and short-term goals focus efforts on initiatives that bring about this level of change. In short, ODEP develops policies and strategies that will:

- Enhance the capacity of service delivery systems to provide appropriate and effective services and supports to youth and adults with disabilities;
- Increase planning and coordination within service delivery systems to develop and improve systems, processes, and services;
- Improve individualization of services to better assist youth and adults with disabilities in seeking, obtaining, and retaining employment or self-employment;

• Increase employer access to supports and services to meet their employment needs;

• Increase the quality of competency-based training for service delivery systems;

• Increase the adoption of universal strategies for service provision; and

• Develop partnerships with and among critical stakeholders to effectively leverage available resources and facilitate implementation of practices and policies that increase employment and self-employment opportunities and the recruitment, retention, and promotion of youth and adults with disabilities.

Three measures inform ODEP of its annual progress in meeting its three goals under the Government Performance and Results Act: (1) The number of policy-related documents; (2) the number of formal agreements; and (3) the number of effective practices. These performance results support achievement of the following intermediate outcome goals: Accessible employment resources; coordinated programs, processes, and services; and adoption of effective practices.

Achievement of these intermediate outcome goals, in turn, supports achievement of the long-term service delivery systems outcome goals, which are marked by increases in these areas: Capacity of service delivery systems; planning and coordination within service delivery systems; and employer access to supports and services for recruitment, retention, and promotion.

On February 1, 2001, in announcing the *New Freedom Initiative (NFI),* President George W. Bush explicitly recognized that in today's global economy America must be able to draw on the talents and creativity of all its citizens and that people with disabilities represent valuable largely untapped human capital. The *NFI* represents an important step towards ensuring that all Americans have the opportunity to learn and develop skills, engage in productive work, and choose where to live and participate in community life.

Developing the talents, skills and capabilities of the workforce has always played an important part in our nation's economic strength. This is even more critical today because America is transitioning to a knowledge-based economy that places a premium on higher skills and education. Millions of new jobs have been created in industries that did not even exist a generation ago. In addition, two-thirds of the estimated 18 million new jobs that will be created over the next 10 years will be in occupations that require some kind of post-secondary education. Therefore, it is more imperative now than at any time ever before that young Americans, including those with disabilities, stay in school, get a high school diploma or GED, and have some kind of education and job training beyond high school.

The nature of what employers demand in the workplace of the 21st century is also changing. High school and college graduates must not only master basic academic skills, but in addition must master more advanced ''applied skills'' such as teamwork, critical thinking, and communication. According, however, to a recent survey of 461 employers conducted by the Conference Board, Corporate Voices for Working Families, the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and the Society for Human Resources many new entrants to the workforce lack these important skills. These business leaders reported that while the three ''R's'' are still fundamental to every employee's ability to do the job, knowledge of applied skills is even more important. (*Are They Really Ready to Work? Employers' Perspectives on the Basic Knowledge and Applied Skills of New Entrants to the 21st Century U.S. Workforce* (2006)).

The need to improve education and employment outcomes of youth with disabilities has been recognized as a national priority over the past several years. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which was signed into law by President Bush in 2002, ushered in sweeping changes in the American educational system as it relates to students with disabilities because it requires that schools be held accountable for their educational progress to the same extent they are held accountable for the educational results of students without disabilities. Further, when the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was reauthorized in 2004, it recognized the increasingly important relationship between education and employment. Thus, the transition planning requirements were expanded to include measurable postsecondary goals related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills.

In addition, *The White House Task Force Report on Disadvantaged Youth* (December 2003), recommended that an interagency group be created to help facilitate interagency collaboration at the state and local levels for federally funded youth programs to develop innovative approaches, enhance the quality of services delivered, improve cost-effectiveness, and improve outcomes for the neediest youth. Over the past several years, in response to the Task Force Report, the Department of Labor has been collaborating with multiple Federal agencies to implement a coordinated shared Federal Youth Vision to more effectively and efficiently serve out-of-school and at-risk youth. The Shared Youth Vision Federal Partnership explicitly recognizes that youth with disabilities, along with high school drop-outs and those at risk of dropping out, court-involved youth or those at risk of involvement, youth in or aging out of foster care, children of incarcerated parents, and migrant, American Indian and Alaska Native youth, are included among our nation's neediest youth. In addition, the Vision partnership recognizes that these youth are an important part of the ''supply pipeline'' needed to fill job vacancies in the knowledge-based economy.

ODEP has also funded several systems change efforts which have focused on improving transition outcomes for youth with disabilities using the Guideposts for Success as a conceptual framework. The *Guideposts*, which include school-based preparatory experiences, career preparation and work-based learning experiences, youth development and leadership, connecting activities, and family involvement and supports, reflect key educational and career development interventions that research has indicated can make a positive difference in the lives of all youth, including youth with disabilities.

Federal and state efforts to improve transition policies and practices for youth with disabilities over the past decade have resulted in some positive gains including increases in graduation rates, enrollment in postsecondary education, and in the number of youth entering the workforce (Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS); Newman, 2005; Cameto and Levine, 2005). For example, national data indicate that there has been some improvement in the overall graduation rate of students with disabilities in the United States. Between the 1995–1996 and 1999–2000 school years, the percentage of youth with disabilities graduating with regular diplomas, as reported by states, grew from 52.6% to 56.2%. During the same period, the percentage of students with disabilities reported as having dropped out of school declined from 34.1% to 29.4% (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Nonetheless, significant challenges remain. National studies and reports have shown that, compared to their non-disabled peers, students with disabilities are less likely to receive a regular high school diploma; drop out

twice as often; and enroll in and complete postsecondary education programs at half the rate.

According to recent reports from the National Longitudinal Transition Study–2 (NLTS–2) (2005) (see *http://www.nlts2.org/*) (Wagner, Marder, *et al.*, 2003; Wagner, Newman, *et al.*, 2005), a study of a nationally representative sample of adolescents with disabilities, students' grade-level equivalent performance on standardized achievement tests was on average 3.6 years behind grade level in reading and mathematics. Among those individuals who were no longer in school, about 28 percent had dropped out prior to receiving a diploma, a rate nearly twice that of their peers without disabilities. In the first years after high school, individuals with disabilities were much less likely to attend postsecondary education than were individuals without disabilities. In addition, about 21 percent of youth with disabilities were not engaged in their community either through postsecondary education, job training, or work in the first years after high school.

In addition, up to two years after leaving high school, about 4 in 10 youth with disabilities are employed as compared to 6 in 10 same-age, out-of-school youth in the general population. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000; NLTS–2) In addition, youth with disabilities are four times more likely to become involved in the juvenile justice system. (National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth, 2005)

According to the NLTS–2, employment rates vary considerably across disability categories for students with disabilities who were enrolled in special education. Youth with learning disabilities, emotional disturbances, other health impairments, or speech impairments are the most likely to be employed in a 1-year period (50% to 60%). In contrast, 15% of youth with autism, approximately one-fourth of youth with multiple disabilities, deaf-blindness, or orthopedic impairments, and about one-third of youth with mental retardation or visual impairments are employed in a 1-year period. Moreover, the 2000 Census revealed that the overall employment rate of Americans with disabilities of working age in 2000 was only around 56 percent, a number which is far below the national average.

The impending changes in our economy in conjunction with the aforementioned data on high school and college graduation rates underscore the need for our nation to continue to direct resources to address the complex and significant barriers to employment many youth with disabilities face in transitioning into the adult world. The research and technical assistance effort proposed herein will support this effort by increasing the capacity of multiple youth service delivery systems by expanding the knowledge base of existing effective practices for improving transition outcomes; identifying, investigating and validating models that promote systems change; and providing proactive support, training, and dissemination of other relevant useful information.

The technical assistance to be provided will build upon ODEP's prior research and technical assistance efforts which focused on promoting increased understanding that:

- Addressing the transition needs of youth with disabilities requires meaningful collaboration and coordination;
- Providing effective services to youth with disabilities in the context of general youth service delivery is not difficult because, as articulated in the *Guideposts for Success*, the vast majority of what they need, are the same things all youth need; and
- Providing effective transition services for all youth, which support positive youth development, requires viewing what youth need holistically.

The research and technical assistance also found that:

- Generic service providers may unknowingly already be serving significant numbers of youth with disabilities as they are overrepresented in all at-risk groups; and
- Generic youth serving delivery systems, such as programs supported by the WIA, bear a part of the responsibility of serving transitioning youth with disabilities.

3. Definitions

Definitions for purposes of this solicitation include:

- Youth with disabilities: Refers to individuals with disabilities who are ages 14 to 24.
- Individual Graduation/Learning Plan: Refers to a plan that emphasizes academic and career development for all students as early as middle school and continues throughout high school. The plans, currently being implemented by many states, assist students in setting post-secondary education and employment goals based on their academic, career, and personal interests, as well as their strengths and weaknesses.

II. Award Information

Estimated Available Funds: The full $1,700,000 for the initial 24 month period of performance will be awarded in 2007.

Period of Performance: 24 months from date of award with up to three (3) additional option years at approximately $1,000,000 per year, depending on performance, identified need, and the availability of future funding.

The U.S. Department of Labor (''DOL'' or ''Department''), Office of Disability Employment Policy (''ODEP''), announces the availability of up to $1,700,000 to fund a national technical assistance and research cooperative agreement.

Note: Selection of an organization as a Grantee does not constitute approval of the grant application as submitted. Before the actual grant is awarded, DOL may enter into negotiations about such items as program components, staffing and funding levels, and administrative systems in place to support grant implementation. If the negotiations do not result in a mutually acceptable submission, the Grant Officer reserves the right to terminate the negotiation and decline to fund the application.

Because ODEP plans to make this award in the form of a cooperative agreement, DOL will have substantial involvement in the administration of the agreement. Such DOL involvement will consist of:

(1) Approval of any sub-contract awarded by the grantee after the grant award;

(2) Participation in site visits to project areas;

(3) Providing advice and consultation to the Grantee on specific program criteria;

(4) Providing the Grantee(s) with technical and programmatic support, including training in DOL monitoring and evaluation systems, and standard procedures regarding DOL management of cooperative agreements;

(5) Reviewing, at reasonable times, all documents pertaining to the project, including status and technical progress reports, and financial reports. ODEP will provide the format for the reports;

(6) Discussing administrative and technical issues pertaining to the project;

(7) Approving all key personnel decisions, and sub-contractors or sub-awardees;

(8) Approving all fact sheets, training materials, press releases and publicity-related materials regarding the project;

(9) Approving all content for online resources developed through project activities, including clearing concepts

for material production and final document production; and

(10) Drafting terms of reference for, and participating in project evaluations.

III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants are consortia made up of a minimum of three (3) entities which may include a combination of any of the following: Public/private non-profits or for-profit organizations including faith-based organizations, and universities and colleges, with demonstrated appropriate experience and expertise in conducting research and providing technical assistance about issues important to increasing employment opportunities for people with disabilities. The expertise required should include, but not be limited to: Education and career planning for transitioning youth, including those with mental health needs; comprehensive transition services delivery; strategies for meeting employer demand and for systems change, professional development strategies for youth service providers; and personal assistance, transportation, health and other related employment support services. There must be a prime or lead member of the consortium who is responsible for overall grant management and serves as the fiscal agent. All applications must clearly identify the lead grant recipient and fiscal agent, as well as all other members of the consortium applying for the grant. In addition, the application must identify the relationship between all of the members of the consortium.

According to section 18 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, an organization, as described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that engages in lobbying activities will not be eligible for the receipt of Federal funds constituting an award, grant, or loan. See 2 U.S.C. 1611; 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(4). Funding restrictions apply. See Section IV(5).

2. Cost Sharing

Cost sharing, matching funds, and cost participation are not required under this SGA. However, leveraging of public and private resources to foster inclusive service delivery and achieve project sustainability is highly encouraged and included under evaluation criteria. See V(1)(b)(9).

3. Other Eligibility Requirements

Legal rules pertaining to inherently religious activities by organizations that receive Federal Financial Assistance:

- Neutral, non-religious criteria that neither favor nor disfavor religion will be employed in the selection of grant recipients and must be employed by grantees or in the selection of sub-awardees.
- The government is generally prohibited from providing direct financial assistance for inherently religious activities.[1]

In addition, no organization or individual investigator/program director may submit more than two separate applications.

IV. Application and Submission Information

1. Addresses To Request Application Package

This SGA contains all the information and forms needed to apply for this grant funding. Application announcements or forms will not be mailed. The **Federal Register** may be obtained from your nearest government office or library. In addition, a copy of this notice and the application requirements may be downloaded from ODEP's Web site at *http://www.dol.gov/odep* and at *http://www.grants.gov.* If additional copies of the standard forms are needed, they can also be downloaded from: *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/grants_forms.html.* All mailed applications must be addressed to: Department of Labor, Procurement Services Center, Attention: Cassandra Mitchell, Reference SGA 07–09, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room S–4307, Washington, DC 20210, Phone Number: (202) 693–4570 (this is not a toll-free number). Applicants are encouraged to apply online at *http://www.grants.gov.* Applicants submitting proposals online are requested to refrain from mailing a hard copy application as well. It is strongly recommended that applicants using *http://www.grants.gov* immediately initiate and complete the ''Get Started'' registration steps at *http://www.grants.gov/GetStarted.* These steps may take multiple days to complete, and this time should be factored into plans for electronic submission in order to avoid facing unexpected delays that could result in the rejection of an application. If submitting electronically through *http://www.grants.gov* it would be appreciated if the application submitted is saved as .doc, .pdf, or .txt files. Except as provided in Section IV.3., any application received after the deadline (hard copy or electronic) will be considered as non-responsive and will not be evaluated.

2. Content and Form of Application Submission

General Requirements: Applicants must submit one (1) paper copy with an original signature, and two (2) additional paper copies of the signed proposal. To aid with the review of applications, DOL also requires applicants to submit an electronic copy of their proposal's Sections II (Executive Summary) and III (Project Narrative) on disc or compact disc (CD) using Microsoft Word. The application (not to exceed 25 pages for Section III), must be double-spaced with standard one-inch margins (top, bottom, and sides) on 8½ × 11-inch paper, and must be presented on single-sided and numbered pages. A font size of at least twelve (12) pitch is required throughout. All text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, and captions must be double-spaced (no more than three lines per vertical inch); and, if using a proportional computer font, must be in at least a 12-point font, and must have an average character density no greater than 18 characters per inch (if using a non-proportional font or a typewriter, must not be more than 12 characters per inch). Applications that fail to meet these requirements will be considered non-responsive.

Cooperative Agreement Mandatory Application Requirements

The three required sections of the application are titled below and described thereafter:

Section I—Project Financial Plan (No page limit).

Section II—Executive Summary—Project Synopsis (Not to exceed two (2) pages).

Section III—Project Narrative (Not to exceed 25 pages).

The mandatory requirements for each section are set forth below. Applications that fail to meet the stated mandatory requirements for each section will be considered non-responsive.

Section I. Project Financial Plan (Budget): The Project Financial Plan will not count against the application page limits. Section I of the application must include the following:

(1) Completed ''SF–424—Application for Federal Assistance.''

Please note that, beginning October 1, 2003, all applicants for Federal grant

[1] In this context, the term direct financial assistance means financial assistance that is provided directly by a government entity or an intermediate organization, as opposed to financial assistance that an organization receives as the result of the genuine and independent private choice of a beneficiary. In other contexts, the term ''direct'' financial assistance may be used to refer to financial assistance that an organization receives directly from the Federal government (also known as ''discretionary'' assistance), as opposed to assistance that it receives from a State or local government (also known as ''indirect'' or ''block'' grant assistance). The term ''direct'' has the former meaning throughout this SGA.

and funding opportunities are required to include a Dun and Bradstreet (DUNS) number with their application. See OMB Notice of Final Policy Issuance, 68 FR 38402 (June 27, 2003). The DUNS number is a nine-digit identification number that uniquely identifies business entities. There is no charge for obtaining a DUNS number (although it may take 14–30 days). To obtain a DUNS number, access the following Web site: *http://www.dunandbradstreet.com* or call 1–866–705–5711. Requests for exemption from the DUNS number requirement must be made to OMB. The Dun and Bradstreet Number of the applicant should be entered in the ''Organizational Unit'' section of block 5 of the SF–424. (See Appendix A of this SGA for required form.)

(2) The SF–424 must contain the original signatures of the legal entity applying for cooperative agreement funding and two additional copies of the signed SF–424. The individual signing the SF–424 on behalf of the applicant must represent and be able to legally bind the responsible financial and administrative entity for a cooperative agreement should that application result in an award. Applicants shall indicate on the SF–424 the organization's Internal Revenue Service (IRS) status (e.g. 501(c)(3) organization), if applicable.

(3) Completed SF–424 A—Budget Information Form by line item for all costs required to implement the project design effectively. (See Appendix B of this SGA for required forms.)

(4) DOL Budget Narrative and Justification that provides sufficient information to support the reasonableness of the costs included in the budget in relation to the service strategy and planned outcomes, including continuous improvement activities.

The DOL Budget Narrative and Justification must describe all costs associated with implementing the project that are to be covered with cooperative agreement funds. The budget must support the travel and associated costs of sending representatives to both a post-award conference and periodic meetings with ODEP staff in Washington, DC (at least once per quarter), at a time and place to be determined. In addition to other administrative requirements identified in section VI(2) of this SGA, the applicant must comply with the ''Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments'' (also known as OMB Circular A–102), codified at 29 CFR part 97, or ''Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations'' (also known as the ''Common Rule''' or OMB Circular A–110), codified at 2 CFR part 215 and 29 CFR part 95.

In addition, the budget submitted for review by DOL must include, on a separate page, a detailed cost analysis of each line item. The costs listed in the detailed cost analysis must comply with the applicable OMB cost principles circulars, as identified in 29 CFR 95.27 and 29 CFR 97.22(b). Justification for administrative costs must be provided. Approval of a budget by DOL is not the same as the approval of actual costs. The applicant must also include the Assurances and Certifications Signature Page (Appendix C) and the Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants (Appendix D).

Section II. Executive Summary—Project Synopsis: The Executive Summary is limited to no more than two single-spaced, single-sided pages on 8½ × 11-inch paper with standard margins throughout. The project synopsis must identify the following:

(1) The lead entity;

(2) The list of consortium members, as appropriate; and

(3) An overview of how the applicant will carry out the technical assistance and research activities described in Section 1 of this solicitation.

Section III. Project Narrative: The DOL Cooperative Agreement Project Narrative is limited to no more than twenty-five (25), 8½ ″ × ″ 11 pages, double-spaced with standard one-inch margins (top, bottom, and sides), and must be presented on single-sided, numbered pages.

Note: Any Appendices, including letters of cooperation and resumes are not included in this twenty-five-page limit.

Applications must include a Project Narrative that addresses the work proposed to be accomplished under the cooperative agreement, and the evaluation/selection criteria in Part V(1) that will be used by reviewers in evaluating the application.

Applicants must limit Section III to the equivalent of not more than 25 pages using the following standard. This page limit does not apply to Section I, the Project Financial Plan (Budget), Section II, the Executive Summary and the Appendices (the assurances and certifications, resumes, a bibliography or references, and the documentation of commitment/formal agreement/letters of support and other materials relevant to the application). A page is 8½ ″ × 11″ (on one side only) with one-inch margins (top, bottom, and sides). All text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, and captions must be double-spaced (no more than three lines per vertical inch); and, if using a proportional computer font, use no smaller than a 12-point font, and an average character density no greater than 18 characters per inch (if using a non-proportional font or a typewriter, do not use more than 12 characters per inch).

The successful applicant will be a Technical Assistance and Research Consortium and will describe in their Project Narrative their innovative and comprehensive plan for accomplishing the technical assistance and research activities described in Part I(1), Description and Purpose, and Part I(2) Background.

The Project Narrative must:

(1) Identify members of the consortium (including the lead entity, a minimum of 3 consortium members is required) and provide documentation (such as letters of intent and memorandum of agreement which will be included in an Appendix) of a formal agreement of participation;

(2) Demonstrate each of the consortium members' relevant experience and expertise; and

(3) Identify how the applicant proposes to disseminate research findings and technical assistance products.

Each Project Narrative must include:

(1) A detailed 24 month management plan for project goals, objectives, and activities;

(2) A detailed 24 month timeline for project activities, including producing and submitting a final report;

(3) A detailed outline for an evaluation of the project (see Section V(1)(F) for more information);

(4) A description of procedures and approaches that will be used to provide ongoing communication, collaboration with, and input from ODEP's Project Officer on all grant-related activities.

(5) A detailed description of how the consortia will work with multiple Federal, State and local public and private entities to implement policy recommendations and strategies identified in carrying out project activities; and

(6) A detailed description of measures that will be taken to ensure that elements of the project's technical assistance model will be sustained following the completion of project activities.

The Project Narrative must describe the proposed staffing for the project and must identify and summarize the qualifications of the personnel who will

carry it out. In addition, the evaluation criteria listed in Section V(1)(c) include consideration of the qualifications, including relevant education, training and experience of key project personnel, as well as the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors. Resumes must be included in the appendices. Key personnel include: Principle Investigator, Project Director, Project Coordinator, Project Manager, Research Analyst, and any other individual playing a substantial role in the project. Minimum qualifications should be commensurate with the role identified in the application. In addition, the applicant must specify in the application, the percentages of time to be dedicated by each key person on the project.

For each staff person named in the application, please provide documentation of all internal and external time commitments. In instances where a staff person is committed on a federally supported project, please provide the project name, Federal office, program title, the project Federal award number, and the amount of committed time by each project year. This information (e.g., Staff: Jane Doe; Project Name: Succeeding in the General Curriculum; Federal office: Office of Special Education Programs; Program title: Field Initiated Research; Award number: H324C980624; Time commitments: Year 1–30%; Year 2–25% and Year 3–40%) can be provided as an appendix to the application.

In general, ODEP will not reduce time commitments on currently funded grants from the time proposed in the original application. Therefore, we will not consider for funding any application where key staff are bid above a time commitment level that staff have available to bid. Further, the time commitments stated in newly submitted applications will not be negotiated down to permit the applicant to receive a new grant award.

The Project Narrative should also describe how the applicant plans to comply with the employment discrimination and equal employment opportunity requirements of the various laws listed in the assurances section.

3. Submission Dates, Times and Addresses

Applications will be accepted commencing May 11, 2007. The closing date for receipt of applications by DOL under this announcement is June 25, 2007.

Applications, including those hand-delivered, must be received by 4:45 p.m. (EST) on the closing date at the address specified below. No exceptions to the mailing and hand-delivery conditions set forth in this notice will be granted. Applications that do not meet the conditions set forth in this notice will be considered non-responsive.

Applications must be mailed or hand-delivered to: U.S. Department of Labor, Procurement Services Center, Attention: Cassandra Mitchell, Reference SGA 07–09, Room S–4307, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Applications sent by e-mail or telefascimile (FAX) will not be accepted.

Hand-Delivered Proposals: It is preferred that applications be mailed at least five (5) days prior to the closing date to ensure timely receipt. Hand-delivered applications will be considered for funding, but must be received by the above specified date and time. Overnight or express delivery from carriers other than the U.S. Postal Service will be considered hand-delivered applications. Failure to adhere to the above instructions will serve as a basis for a determination of non-responsiveness.

Applicants are advised that mail in the Washington DC. area may be delayed due to mail decontamination procedures and may wish to take this information into consideration when preparing to meet the application deadline.

Late Applications: Any application received by the designated office after the exact date and time specified will be considered non-responsive, unless it is received before awards are made and it: (a) Is determined that its late receipt was caused by DOL error after timely delivery to the Department of Labor; (b) was sent by U.S. Postal Service registered or certified mail not later than the fifth calendar day before the date specified for receipt of applications (e.g., an application submitted in response to a solicitation requiring receipt of applications by the 20th of the month must have been postmarked by the 15th of that month); or (c) was sent by the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Next Day Service to addressee not later than 5 p.m. at the place of mailing two (2) working days prior to the date specified for receipt of applications. The term ''working days'' excludes weekends and Federal holidays. ''Postmarked'' means a printed, stamped, or otherwise placed impression (exclusive of a postage meter machine impression) that is readily identifiable without further action as having been supplied or affixed on the date of mailing by an employee of the U.S. Postal Service.

Withdrawal of Applications: An application that is timely submitted may be withdrawn by written notice or telegram (including mailgram) at any time before an award is made. Applications may be withdrawn in person by the applicant or by an authorized representative thereof, if the representative's identity is made known and the representative signs a receipt for the proposal.

4. Intergovernmental Review

This funding opportunity is not subject to Executive Order 12372, ''Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.''

5. Funding Restrictions

(a) *Funding Levels:* The total funding available for this solicitation is $1,700,000. The Department of Labor reserves the right to negotiate the amounts to be awarded under this competition. Please be advised that requests exceeding the maximum stated amount will be considered non-responsive. Additionally, there will be no reimbursement of pre-award costs.

(b) *Period of Performance:* The period of performance will be for 24 months from the date of the award unless modified. It is expected that the successful applicant will begin program operations under this solicitation immediately upon receiving the ''Notice of Award.''

(c) *Option Year Funding:* Up to three (3) additional option years may be available at approximately $1,000,000 per year, depending on performance, identified need and the availability of future funding.

(d) *Indirect Charges:* If indirect charges are claimed in the proposed budget, the recipient must provide on a separate sheet, the following information:

(1) Name and address of cognizant Federal audit agency;

(2) Name, address and phone number (including area code) of the Government auditor;

(3) Documentation from the cognizant agency indicating:

(a) Current indirect cost rate and the base against which the rate should be applied;

(b) Effective period (dates) for the rate; and

(c) Date last rate was computed and negotiated.

(4) If no government audit agency computed and authorized the rate claimed, a proposed rate with justification may be submitted providing a brief explanation of computation, who computed the rate and the date of the computation.

Successful applicants will be required to negotiate an acceptable and allowable rate within 90 days of grant award with the appropriate DOL Regional Office of Cost Determination or with the applicant's cognizant agency for indirect cost rates (See Office of Management and Budget Web site at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/attach.html*). The recipient shall call the Office of Cost Determination at 202–693–4100 for the initial contact.

However, applications claiming an indirect cost rate greater than 15% will not be considered.

V. Application Review Information

1. Evaluation Criteria

A technical panel will review grant applications against the criteria listed below, on the basis of the maximum points indicated.

(a) Significance of the Proposed Project (10 points)

In determining the significance of the proposed research, the Department will consider the following factors:

1. The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of problems, issues, or effective strategies for providing comprehensive transition services and supports to youth with disabilities;

2. The likelihood that the proposed project will result in systems change or improvement;

3. The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population as they relate to employment;

4. The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings;

5. The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project; and

6. The extent to which the proposed project builds upon prior work done by ODEP and its partners around youth in transition, including the *Guideposts for Success* and related policies and practices.

(b) Project Design (25 points)

In evaluating the quality of the proposed project design, the Department will consider the following factors:

1. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;

2. The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives;

3. The extent to which the proposed project will effectively contribute to increased knowledge and understanding by building upon current theory, research, and effective practices;

4. The extent to which the proposed project will be coordinated with similar or related Federal technical assistance, research, training, and information efforts;

5. The extent to which the proposed project encourages involvement of youth with disabilities and their families, relevant experts, and organizations;

6. The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project;

7. The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services;

8. The adequacy of the documentation submitted in support of the proposed project to demonstrate the commitment of each entity or individual included in project implementation;

9. The extent to which the proposed project leverages other public and private resources to foster inclusive service delivery and sustainability and provides other concrete evidence of sustainability, including appropriate letters of support included in the appendices; and

10. The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a comprehensive strategy for providing technical assistance and conducting research to identify and evaluate systems models that effectively integrate services for students with disabilities into individual learning/graduation plans and ensure that they benefit from these plans to the same extent as their peers without disabilities.

(c) Organizational Capacity and Quality of Key Personnel (25 points)

Applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant demonstrates organizational capacity and quality of key personnel to implement the proposed project, including:

1. Demonstrated experience with similar projects providing technical assistance and conducting research relating to youth in transition;

2. Qualifications and experience of the applicant's key personnel and consultants;

3. Commitment to developing and sustaining work across key stakeholders;

4. Experience and commitment of any proposed consultants or subcontractors; and

5. Appropriateness of the organization's structure to carry out the project.

(d) Budget and Resource Capacity (10 points)

In evaluating the capacity of the applicant to carry out the proposed project, ODEP will consider the following factors:

1. The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project; and

2. The extent to which the anticipated costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(e) Quality of the Management Plan (15 points)

In evaluating the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, ODEP will consider the following factors:

1. The extent to which the management plan for project implementation appears likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined staff responsibilities, time allocation to project activities, time lines, milestones for accomplishing project tasks, project deliverables and information on adequacy of other resources necessary for project implementation;

2. The extent to which the management plan appears likely to result in sustainable activities beyond the period of direct Federal investment;

3. The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services relating to the scope of work for the proposed project; and

4. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and/or principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(f). Quality of the Project Evaluation (15 points)

In evaluating the quality of the project's evaluation design, ODEP will consider the following factors:

1. The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, context, and outcomes of the proposed project;

2. The extent to which the design of the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures and methods that will clearly document the project's intended outputs and outcomes and will produce measurable quantitative and qualitative data;

3. The extent to which the evaluation will provide Federal, State and local government entities with useful information about transition and systems change models suitable for replication or testing in other settings; and

4. The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide measures that will inform ODEP's annual performance goals and measures and ODEP's long-term strategic goals.

2. Review and Selection Process

A technical review panel will objectively rate each complete application against the criteria described in this SGA. The panel recommendations to the Grant Officer, including any point scores, are advisory in nature. The Grant Officer may elect to award grants either with or without discussion with the applicant. In situations where no discussion occurs, an award will be based on the signed SF–424 form (see Appendix A), which constitutes a binding offer.

The Grant Officer may consider the availability of funds and any information that is available and will make final award decisions based on what is most advantageous to the government, considering factors such as the advisory recommendations from the grant technical evaluation panel and the geographic distribution of Federally funded grants.

3. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

Announcement of this award is expected to occur within 30 days of award. The cooperative agreement will be awarded by no later than September 28, 2007.

VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices

The Notice of Award signed by the Grant Officer is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail and/or by electronic means to the authorized representative listed on the SF–424 Grant Application. Notice that an organization has been selected as a grant recipient does not constitute final approval of the grant application as submitted. Before the actual grant award, the Grant Officer and/or the Grant Officer's Technical Representative may enter into negotiations concerning such items as program components, funding levels, and administrative systems. If the negotiations do not result in an acceptable submittal, the Grant Officer reserves the right to terminate the negotiation and decline to fund the proposal.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

All grantees, including faith-based organizations, will be subject to applicable Federal laws (including provisions of appropriations law), regulations, and the applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars. The grant awarded under this SGA will be subject to the following administrative standards and provisions, and requirements applicable to particular entities. The applicant must include assurances and certifications that it will comply with these laws in its grant application. The assurances and certifications are attached as Appendix C.

a. Regulations

29 CFR parts 31 and 32—Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs of the Department of Labor (respectively, effectuation of Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, and on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefiting from Federal Financial Assistance).

29 CFR part 35—Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities receiving Federal Financial Assistance from the Department of Labor.

29 CFR part 36—Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance.

29 CFR part 93—New Restrictions on Lobbying.

29 CFR part 95—Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations, and with Commercial Organizations, Foreign Governments, Organizations Under the Jurisdiction of Foreign Governments and International Organizations.

29 CFR part 96—Federal Standards for Audit of Federally Funded Grants, Contracts and Agreements.

29 CFR part 97—Uniform Administrative Regulations for Grants to States, Local Governments or Tribes.

29 CFR part 98—Federal Standards for Government wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).

29 CFR part 99—Federal Standards for Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

29 CFR part 2—General Participation in Department of Labor Programs by Faith-Based and Community Organizations; Equal Treatment of All Department of Labor Program Participants and Beneficiaries.

Applicable cost principles under OMB Circulars A–21, A–87, A–122, or 48 CFR part 31.

b. Travel

Any travel undertaken in performance of this cooperative agreement shall be subject to and in strict accordance with Federal travel regulations.

c. Acknowledgement of DOL Funding

Printed Materials: In all circumstances, the following shall be displayed on printed materials prepared by the grantee while in receipt of DOL grant funding: ''Preparation of this item was funded by the United States Department of Labor under Grant No. [insert the appropriate Grant number].''

All printed materials must also include the following notice: ''This document does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Labor, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.''

Public reference to grant: When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds must clearly state:

- The percentage of the total costs of the program or project, which will be financed with Federal money;
- The dollar amount of Federal financial assistance for the project or program; and
- The percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by non-governmental sources.

Use of DOL and ODEP Logo: In consultation with DOL/ODEP, the Grantee must acknowledge DOL's role as described. The DOL and/or ODEP logo may be applied to DOL-funded material prepared for world-wide distribution, including posters, videos, pamphlets, research documents, national survey results, impact evaluations, best practice reports, and other publications of global interest. The Grantee must consult with DOL on whether the logo may be used on any such items prior to final draft or final preparation for distribution. In no event shall the DOL and/or ODEP logo be placed on any item until DOL has given the grantee written permission to use the logo on the item.

All documents must include the following notice: ''This document does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Labor, nor does mention of trade names,

commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.''

d. Intellectual Property

Please be advised that DOL will reserve a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, distribute, publicly display and perform, and create derivative works from, and to authorize others to use, for Federal Government purposes:

(a) Any work developed under a grant, subgrant, or contract under a grant or subgrant; and

(b) Any rights to which a grantee, subgrantee or a contractor purchases ownership with grant support.

In addition, the grantee will agree to notify DOL of any pre-existing copyrighted materials it intends to incorporate into materials developed under the grant, and, prior to such incorporation, the grantee will agree that it will acquire, on behalf of DOL, any necessary licenses to allow DOL to exercise the rights described in the paragraph above.

e. Approval of Key Personnel and Subcontractors

The recipient shall notify the Grant Officer at least 14 calendar days in advance if any key personnel are to be removed or diverted from the cooperative agreement, shall supply written justification as part of this notice as to why these persons are to be removed or diverted, shall provide the names(s) of the proposed substitute or replacement, and shall include information on each new individual's qualifications such as education and work experience.

VII. Reporting and Monitoring

ODEP is responsible for ensuring effective implementation of this cooperative agreement, in accordance with the provisions of this announcement and the terms of the cooperative agreement award document. Applicants should assume that ODEP staff will conduct on-site project reviews periodically. Reviews will focus on timely project implementation, performance in meeting the cooperative agreement's objectives, tasks and responsibilities, expenditures of cooperative agreement funds on allowable activities, and administration of project activities. Projects may be subject to other additional reviews, at the discretion of the ODEP.

The selected applicant must submit on a quarterly basis, beginning ninety (90) days from the award of the grant, financial and activity reports under this program as prescribed by OMB Circular A–110, codified at 2 CFR part 215 and 29 CFR part 95. Specifically the following reports will be required:

1. *Quarterly report:* The quarterly report is estimated to take five (5) hours to complete. The form for the quarterly report will be provided by ODEP. The Department will work with the grantee to help refine the requirements of the report, which, among other things, will include measures of ongoing analysis for continuous improvement. This report will be filed using an on-line reporting system. The form will be submitted within thirty (30) days of the close of the quarter.

2. *Standard Form 269, Financial Status Report Form:* This form is to be completed and submitted on a quarterly basis using the on-line electronic reporting system unless ODEP provides different instructions.

3. *Final Project Report:* The Final Project Report is to include an assessment of project performance and outcomes achieved. It is estimated that this report will take twenty (20) hours to complete. This report will be submitted in hard copy and on electronic disk using a format and following instructions, to be provided by ODEP. A draft of the final report is due to ODEP sixty (60) days before the end of the period of performance of the cooperative agreement. The final report is due to ODEP and the DOL Grants Office ten (10) days before the end of the period of performance of the cooperative agreement.

The Department will arrange for an evaluation of the outcomes, impacts, accomplishments, and benefits of each funded project. The grantee must agree to cooperate with this evaluation and must make available records on all parts of project activity, including available data on service delivery models being studied, and provide access to personnel, as specified by the evaluator(s), under the direction of ODEP. This evaluation is separate from the ongoing evaluation for continuous improvement required of the grantee for project implementation.

Technical assistance efforts will be coordinated with ODEP's other technical assistance efforts, including, if applicable, ODEP's National Center on Workforce and Disability for Youth (NCWD/Y). The Grantee must also agree to work with ODEP in its various technical assistance efforts in order to freely share with others what is learned about transitioning youth with disabilities. The grantee must agree to collaborate with other research institutes, centers, studies, and evaluations that are supported by the DOL and other relevant Federal agencies, as appropriate. Finally, the grantees must agree to actively utilize the programs sponsored by the ODEP, including the Job Accommodation Network (*http://www.jan.wvu.edu*), and the Employer Assistance and Recruiting Network (*http://www.earnworks.com*).

The successful applicant will be required to prepare a strategic plan for achieving the goals of the cooperative agreement for the initial 24 month period of performance and submit it to ODEP within 45 days of award for approval.

VIII. Agency Contacts

Any questions regarding this SGA should be directed to Cassandra Mitchell, e-mail address: *mitchell.cassandra@dol.gov,* tel: 202–693–4570 (note that this is not a toll-free number). To obtain further information about the Office of Disability Employment Policy of the U.S. Department of Labor, visit the DOL Web site of the Office of Disability Employment Policy at *http://www.dol.gov/odep.*

IX. Appendices

The appendices are as follows:

Appendix A. Application for Federal Assistance, Form SF–424.

Appendix B. Budget Information Sheet, Form SF–424A.

Appendix C. Assurances and Certifications Signature Page.

(Appendices D and E are not applicable).

Appendix F. Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants.

Detailed information and document locations:

- Appendix A. Application for Federal Assistance, Form SF–424 (OMB No. 4040–0004).
- Appendix B. Budget Information Sheet, Form SF–424A (OMB No. 0348–0044). Both forms SF–424 and 424A can be obtained at the following Web address: *http://apply.grants.gov/agency/FormLinks?family=7.*
- Appendix F. Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants (OMB No. 1890–0014).
- The Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants form can be obtained at the following Web address: *http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/surveyeo.pdf.*

(If you are viewing this in an electronic format and are receiving ''page not found'', please cut and paste the URL into your browser window)

Appendix C. Assurances and Certifications Signature Page.

Certifications and Assurances

Assurances and Certifications Signature Page

The Department of Labor will not award a grant or agreement where the grantee/recipient has failed to accept the assurances and certifications contained in this section. By signing and returning this signature page, the grantee/recipient is providing the certifications set forth below:

A. Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension, Other Responsibility Matters—Primary Covered Transactions and Certifications Regarding Drug-Free/Tobacco-Free Workplace.

B. Certification of Release of Information,

C. Assurances—Non-Construction Programs,

D. Applicant is not a 501(c)(4) organization.

Applicant Name and Legal Address:

If there is any reason why one of the assurances or certifications listed cannot be signed, please explain. Applicant need only submit and return this signature page with the grant application. All other instruction shall be kept on file by the applicant.

Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Title

Applicant Organization

Date Submitted

Please Note: This signature page and any pertinent attachments which may be required by these assurances and certifications shall be attached to the applicant's cost proposal.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of May 2007.

Lisa Harvey,

Grant Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9117 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FK–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,404]

Air System Components, Inc.; El Paso, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 30, 2007 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers of Air System Components, Inc., El Paso, Texas.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by a duplicate petition (TA–W–61,367) instituted on April 24, 2007 that is the subject of an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Further investigation in this case would duplicate efforts; therefore the investigation under this petition has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 4th day of May 2007.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9100 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,548]

Alan White Company; Sulligent, AL; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 13, 2007, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 23, 2007 (72 FR 20139).

The previous investigation initiated on December 7, 2006, resulted in a negative determination issued on March 8, 2007, was based on the finding that imports of upholstered furniture did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 22, 2007 (72 FR 13528).

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information regarding the subject firm's customers. Upon further review of the initial investigation, the Department requested from a company official an additional list of declining customers of the subject firm.

A survey of these customers revealed that a major declining customer increased its imports of upholstered furniture during the relevant period. The imports accounted for a meaningful portion of the subject plant's lost sales and production.

In accordance with Section 246 the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Alan White Company, Sulligent, Alabama, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Alan White Company, Sulligent, Alabama, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after November 22, 2005 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 8th day of May 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9103 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,757]

Alan White Company; Shannon, MS; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 12, 2007, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 23, 2007 (72 FR 20139).

The previous investigation initiated on January 12, 2007, resulted in a negative determination issued on March 8, 2007, was based on the finding that imports of upholstered furniture did not

contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 22, 2007 (72 FR 13528).

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information regarding subject firm's customers. Upon further review of the initial investigation, the Department requested from a company official an additional list of declining customers of the subject firm.

A survey of these customers revealed that a major declining customer increased its imports of upholstered furniture during the relevant period. The imports accounted for a meaningful portion of the subject plant's lost sales and production.

In accordance with Section 246 the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Alan White Company, Shannon, Mississippi, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Alan White Company, Shannon, Mississippi, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 11, 2006 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 8th day of May, 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9105 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[TA–W–60,850]

Employment and Training Administration: Alan White Company Corporate Office, Stamps, AR; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 12, 2007, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 23, 2007 (72 FR 20140).

The previous investigation initiated on January 30, 2007, resulted in a negative determination issued on March 28, 2007, was based on the finding that workers of the subject firm performed administrative services and supported production of two affiliated plants (Sulligent, Alabama and Shannon, Mississippi) whose workers were recently denied TAA eligibility. The investigation revealed that imports of upholstered furniture did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2007 (72 FR 17938).

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information regarding customers of Sulligent, Alabama and Shannon, Mississippi plants. Upon further review of the initial investigation, the Department requested an additional list of declining customers of these production facilities from a company official.

The survey of the additional customers revealed that a major declining customer increased its imports of upholstered furniture during the relevant period. The imports accounted for a meaningful portion of the subject plant's lost sales and production.

In accordance with Section 246 the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Alan White Company, Shannon, Mississippi, and Sulligent, Alabama, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

- All workers of Alan White Company, Corporate Office, Stamps, Arkansas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 29, 2006 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9106 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–59,299; TA–W–59,299A; TA–W–59,299B; TA–W–59,299C]

Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Clearfield, PA; Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Sales And Merchandising Office, New York, NY; Bayer Clothing Group, Inc.,Target Sales Corp, Naperville, IL; Bayer Clothing Group, Inc.,Target Sales Corp., Frisco, TX; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on May 31, 2006, applicable to workers of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Clearfield, Pennsylvania. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 22, 2006 (71 FR 35949).

At the request of a company official, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that worker separations have occurred involving employees of the New York, New York Sales and Merchandising Office and the Target Sales Corporation, Naperville, Illinois and Frisco, Texas facilities of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Clearfield, Pennsylvania.

Employees of the New York, New York Sales and Merchandising Office and Target Sales Corp., Inc., Naperville, Illinois and Frisco, Texas provide sales function services for the production of suits, blazers and pants produced by the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include employees of the New York, New York Sales and Merchandising Office and Target Sales Corp., Inc., Naperville, Illinois and Frisco, Texas facilities of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Clearfield, Pennsylvania who were adversely affected by a shift in production to Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–59,299 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Clearfield, Pennsylvania (TA–W–59,299), Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Sales and Merchandising Office, New York, New York (TA–W–59,299A) and Bayer Clothing Group, Inc., Target Sales Corp., Naperville, Illinois (TA–W–59,299B) and Target Sales Corp., Frisco, Texas, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 4, 2006, through May 31, 2008, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9101 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[TA–W–61,360]

Employment and Training Administration: Bayer Clothing Group Inc., Sales and Merchandising Office, New York, NY; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 23, 2007 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Bayer Clothing Group Inc., Sales and Merchandising Office, New York, New York.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active amended certification (TA–W–59,299A) which expires on May 31, 2008. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May, 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9109 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[TA–W–61,362]

Employment and Training Administration: Bayer Clothing Group Inc., Target Sales Corp., Naperville, IL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 23, 2007 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Bayer Clothing Group Inc., Target Sales Corp., Naperville, Illinois.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an active amended certification (TA–W–59,299B) which expires on May 31, 2008. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of May, 2007

Linda G. Poole

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9110 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,357]

Medtronic Vascular; Santa Rosa, CA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 23, 2007 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Medtronic Vascular, Santa Rosa, California.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of May 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9108 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,734]

Primary Staffing Services, Inc.; Workers Employed at Pearson Artworks, a Division of Pearson Education, Inc.; York, PA; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked April 12, 2007, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was

issued on March 15, 2007 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 30, 2007 (72 FR 15168).

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that imports of WEB based line art illustrations did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred.

The Department reviewed the request for reconsideration and has determined that the petitioner has provided additional information. Therefore, the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 4th day of May, 2007.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9104 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,396]

Rayolite; Division of Pac-Tec Incorporated; Newark, OH; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 30, 2007, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Rayolite, Division of Pac-Tec Incorporated, Newark, Ohio.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. The petitioner was not a company official but one of the dislocated workers. A petition filed by workers must be filed by three (3) individuals. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 4th day of May 2007.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9111 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–61,159]

Sony Technology Center—Pittsburgh; SXRD Rear Projection Television Division Including On-Site Leased Workers of Staffmark and Ruggieri Enterprises, D/B/A Spherion, Employed Through Staffmark; Mt. Pleasant, PA; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on April 12, 2007, applicable to workers of Sony Technology Center—Pittsburgh, SXRD Rear Projection Television Division, including on-site leased workers of Staffmark, Mt. Pleasant, Pennsylvania. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 26, 2007 (72 FR 20873).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of large screen rear projection televisions.

New information shows that leased workers of Ruggieri Enterprises, d/b/a Spherion, were employed on-site through Staffmark, at the Mt. Pleasant, Pennsylvania location of Sony Technology Center—Pittsburgh, SXRD Rear Projection Television Division.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include leased workers of Ruggieri Enterprises, d/b/a Spherion, working on-site through Staffmark, at the Anderson, Indiana location of the subject firm.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers employed on-site at Sony Technology Center—Pittsburgh, SXRD Rear Projection Television Division, Mt. Pleasant, Pennsylvania who were adversely affected by a shift in production to Mexico.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–61,159 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Sony Electronics Center—Pittsburgh, SXRD Rear Projection Television Division including leased workers of Staffmark and Ruggieri Enterprises, d/b/a Spherion, employed through Staffmark, Mt. Pleasant, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after March 20, 2006, through April 12, 2009, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of May 2007.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9107 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–60,195]

Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc.; Kidde Residential and Commercial Division Including On-Site Temporary Workers of Special Teams Power and Aerotek; Mebane, NC; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on October 12, 2006, applicable to workers of Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc., Kidde Residential and Commercial Division, Mebane, North Carolina. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on October 25, 2006 (71 FR 62490).

At the request of a petitioner, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of portable fire extinguishers.

New information shows that a temporary worker of Aerotek was employed on-site at Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc., Kidde Residential and Commercial Division, Mebane, North Carolina.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include a temporary worker of Aerotek working on-site at the Mebane, North Carolina location of the subject firm.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers employed at Walter Kidde Portable

Equipment, Inc., Kidde Residential and Commercial Division, Mebane, North Carolina who were adversely affected by a shift in production to Mexico.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–60,195 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc., Kidde Residential & Commercial Division, including on-site temporary workers of Special Team Power and Aerotek, Mebane, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 1, 2005, through October 12, 2008, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 4th day of May 2007.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–9102 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (#1171).

Date/Time: June 7, 2007; 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 920, Virtual meeting, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Open.

Contact Person: Mr. Tyrone Jordan, Office of the Assistant Director, Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 905, Arlington, VA 22230, 703–292–8741.

Summary Minutes: May be obtained from contact person listed above.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations to the National Science Foundation on major goals and policies pertaining to Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate programs and activities.

Agenda: Topics:

- Science of Science and Innovation Policy.
- Human and Social Dynamics Priority Area.
- International Polar Year.
- Division of Social & Economic Sciences: Committee of Visitors (COV) Report.
- Initiatives for the FY 2009 OMB Budget.
- NSTC Subcommittee on the SBE Sciences—Prospectus of Grand Challenges.
- Briefing on IPAMM (Working Group on Impact of Proposal Award and Management Mechanisms).
- Agenda Items for fall 2007 Meeting.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–9091 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–247 and 50–286]

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; Notice of Receipt and Availability of Application for Renewal of Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3; Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–26 and DPR–64 for an Additional 20-Year Period

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) has received an application, dated April 23, 2007, as supplemented by letter dated May 3, 2007, from Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., filed pursuant to Section 104b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 54 (10 CFR part 54), to renew the operating licenses for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3. Renewal of the licenses would authorize the applicant to operate the facility for an additional 20-year period beyond the period specified in the current operating licenses. The current operating licenses for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 (DPR–26 and DPR–64) expire on September 28, 2013, and December 12, 2015, respectively. The Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 are Pressurized Water Reactors designed by Westinghouse. The units are located in Buchanan, NY. The acceptability of the tendered application for docketing, and other matters including an opportunity to request a hearing, will be the subject of subsequent **Federal Register** notices. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852 or electronically from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room under accession number ML071210507. The ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room is accessible from the NRC's Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html*. In addition, the application is available at *http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/operating/licensing/renewal/applications.html*, on the NRC's Web page, while the application is under review. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, extension 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*.

A copy of the license renewal application for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 is also available to local residents near the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units at the following three public libraries: the White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601; the Field Library, 4 Nelson Avenue, Peekskill, NY 10566; and the Hendrick Hudson Free Library, 185 Kings Ferry Road, Montrose, NY 10548.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of May, 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

P.T. Kuo,

Director, Division of License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E7–9123 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Order Imposing Fingerprinting and Criminal History Records Check Requirements for Unescorted Access to All Research and Test Reactor Licensees Identified in Attachment 1 (Effective Immediately); Correction

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice appearing in the **Federal Register** on May 4, 2007 (72 FR 25337). This action is necessary to publish an attachment that was inadvertently omitted.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel S. Collins, Branch Chief, Research and Test Reactors Branch A, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–8707, e-mail *dxc1@nrc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A document was published on May 4, 2007 (72 FR 25337), that should have included an Attachment 2. This document is published to include Attachment 2.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of May 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Daniel S. Collins,

Branch Chief, Research and Test Reactors, Branch A, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Attachment 2—Requirements for Fingerprinting and Criminal History Checks of Individuals for Determining Unescorted Access

General Requirements

Licensees Shall Comply With the Following Requirements of This Attachment

1. Each Licensee subject to the provisions of this attachment shall fingerprint each individual who is seeking or permitted unescorted access as defined in the associated Order. The Licensee shall review and use the information received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and ensure that the provisions contained in the subject Order and this attachment are satisfied.

2. The Licensee shall notify each affected individual that the fingerprints will be used to secure a review of his/her criminal history record and inform the individual of the procedures for revising the record or including an explanation in the record, as specified in the ''Right to Correct and Complete Information'' section of this attachment.

3. Fingerprints for unescorted access need not be taken again if an individual who has a favorably-decided U.S. Government criminal history check within the last five (5) years, or who has an active federal security clearance, which included a U.S. Government criminal history check. Written confirmation from the Agency/employer which granted the federal security clearance or reviewed the criminal history check must be provided for these cases. The Licensee must retain this documentation for a period of three (3) years from the date the individual no longer requires unescorted access.

4. All fingerprints obtained by the Licensee pursuant to this Order must be submitted to the Commission for transmission to the FBI.

5. The Licensee shall review the information received from the FBI and consider it, in conjunction with the other requirements for unescorted access, in making a determination whether to grant, or continue to allow, unescorted access.

6. The Licensee shall use any information obtained as part of a criminal history records check solely for the purpose of determining an individual's suitability for unescorted access.

7. The Licensee shall document the basis for its determination whether to grant, or continue to allow, unescorted access.

Prohibitions

A Licensee shall not base a final determination to deny an individual unescorted access solely on the basis of information received from the FBI involving: An arrest more than one (1) year old for which there is no information of the disposition of the case, or an arrest that resulted in dismissal of the charge or an acquittal.

A Licensee shall not use information received from a criminal history check obtained pursuant to this Order in a manner that would infringe upon the rights of any individual under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, nor shall the Licensee use the information in any way which would discriminate among individuals on the basis of race, religion, national origin, sex, or age.

Procedures for Processing Fingerprint Checks

For the purpose of complying with this Order, Licensees shall, using an appropriate method listed in 10 CFR 73.4, submit to the NRC's Division of Facilities and Security, Mail Stop T–6E46, one completed, legible standard fingerprint card (Form FD–258, ORIMDNRCOOOZ) or, where practicable, other fingerprint records for each individual seeking unescorted access, to the Director of the Division of Facilities and Security, marked for the attention of the Division's Criminal History Check Section. Copies of these forms may be obtained by writing the Office of Information Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, by calling 301–415–5877, or by e-mail to *forms@nrc.gov*. Practicable alternative formats are set forth in 10 CFR 73.4. The Licensee shall establish procedures to ensure that the quality of the fingerprints taken results in minimizing the rejection rate of fingerprint cards due to illegible or incomplete cards.

The NRC will review submitted fingerprint cards for completeness. Any Form FD–258 fingerprint record containing omissions or evident errors will be returned to the Licensee for corrections. The fee for processing fingerprint checks includes one re-submission if the initial submission is returned by the FBI because the fingerprint impressions cannot be classified. The one free re-submission must have the FBI Transaction Control Number reflected on the re-submission. If additional submissions are necessary, they will be treated as initial submittals and will require a second payment of the processing fee.

Fees for processing fingerprint checks are due upon application. Licensees shall submit payment with the application for processing fingerprints by corporate check, certified check, cashier's check, money order, or electronic payment, made payable to ''U.S. NRC.'' [For guidance on making electronic payments, contact the Facilities Security Branch, Division of Facilities and Security, at 301–415–7404]. Combined payment for multiple applications is acceptable. The application fee (currently $27) is the sum of the user fee charged by the FBI for each fingerprint card or other fingerprint record submitted by the NRC on behalf of a Licensee, and an NRC processing fee, which covers administrative costs associated with NRC handling of Licensee fingerprint submissions. The Commission will directly notify Licensees who are subject to this regulation of any fee changes.

The Commission will forward to the submitting Licensee all data received from the FBI as a result of the Licensee's application(s) for criminal history checks, including the FBI fingerprint record.

Right to Correct and Complete Information

Prior to any final adverse determination, the Licensee shall make available to the individual the contents of any criminal records obtained from the FBI for the purpose of assuring correct and complete information. Written confirmation by the individual of receipt of this notification must be maintained by the Licensee for a period of one (1) year from the date of the notification. If, after reviewing the record, an individual believes that it is incorrect or incomplete in any respect and wishes to change, correct, or update the alleged deficiency, or to explain any matter in the record, the individual may initiate challenge procedures. These procedures include either direct application by the individual challenging the record to the agency (i.e., law enforcement agency) that contributed the questioned information, or direct challenge as to the accuracy or completeness of any entry on the criminal history record to the Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation Identification Division, Washington, DC 20537–9700 (as set forth in 28 CFR 16.30 through 16.34). In the latter case, the FBI forwards the challenge to the

agency that submitted the data and requests that agency to verify or correct the challenged entry.

Upon receipt of an official communication directly from the agency that contributed the original information, the FBI Identification Division makes any changes necessary in accordance with the information supplied by that agency. The Licensee must provide at least ten (10) days for an individual to initiate an action challenging the results of an FBI criminal history records check after the record is made available for his/her review. The Licensee may make a final determination on unescorted access based upon the criminal history record only upon receipt of the FBI's ultimate confirmation or correction of the record. Upon a final adverse determination on unescorted access, the Licensee shall provide the individual its documented basis for denial. Unescorted access shall not be granted to an individual during the review process, except as allowed by the Order.

Protection of Information

1. Each Licensee who obtains a criminal history record on an individual pursuant to this Order shall establish and maintain a system of files and procedures for protecting the record and the personal information from unauthorized disclosure.

2. The Licensee may not disclose the record or personal information collected and maintained to persons other than the subject individual, his/her representative, or to those who have a need to access the information in performing assigned duties in the process of determining unescorted access. No individual authorized to have access to the information may re-disseminate the information to any other individual who does not have a need-to-know.

3. The personal information obtained on an individual from a criminal history record check may be transferred to another Licensee if the Licensee holding the criminal history record receives the individual's written request to re-disseminate the information contained in his/her file, and the gaining Licensee verifies information such as the individual's name, date of birth, social security number, sex, and other applicable physical characteristics for identification purposes.

4. The Licensee shall make criminal history records, obtained under this section, available for examination by an authorized representative of the NRC to determine compliance with the regulations and laws.

5. The Licensee shall retain all fingerprint and criminal history records received from the FBI, or a copy if the individual's file has been transferred, for three (3) years after termination of employment or denial to unescorted access. After the required three (3) year period, these documents shall be destroyed by a method that will prevent reconstruction of the information in whole or in part.

[FR Doc. E7–9122 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

PEACE CORPS

Information Collection Requests Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Peace Corps.

ACTION: Notice of information collection.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, this notice invites the public to comment on the proposed collection of information by the Peace Corps' Office of the Inspector General. The Peace Corps' Office of the Inspector General wishes to collect feedback on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Peace Corps medical clearance process. The Office of the Inspector General will contact the former applicants by e-mail, telephone or mail and will request them to complete an online or paper survey in which they will share information on their experience completing the medical clearance portion of the Peace Corps application process. A small percentage of these applicants will also be contacted for telephone interviews.

DATES: Submit comments on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Shelley Elbert, Senior Evaluator, Office of Inspector General, Peace Corps, 1111 20th Street, NW., Room L560, Washington, DC 20526. Shelley Elbert can be contacted by telephone at 202–692-2904 or e-mail at *selbert@peacecorps.gov*. E-mail comments must be made in text and not in attachments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shelley Elbert, Senior Evaluator, Office of Inspector General, Peace Corps, 1111 20th Street, NW., Room L560, Washington, DC 20526.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this survey is to collect feedback from Peace Corps applicants on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Peace Corps medical clearance system. The Peace Corps medical clearance process is the system by which the agency determines whether an applicant is medically fit to become a Peace Corps Volunteer. The applicants who engaged in the medical clearance process are one of the best sources of information on whether the process is running effectively. Determining whether the medical clearance is processing applications efficiently and effectively is critical to the mission of the Peace Corps. There is no statutory or regulatory requirement for this information.

The Peace Corps Office of the Inspector General will use this information to evaluate the current status of the medical clearance system and to make recommendations for necessary changes in policy and or/ systems.

Method: The information will be collected primarily through an online survey. A small percentage of those who respond to the online survey will be contacted for additional information through telephone or face to face interviews.

Title: Peace Corps Medical Clearance Survey.

OMB Control Number: [To be assigned.]

Type of Review: Emergency New Collection of Information.

Affected Public: Former applicants to the Peace Corps who at least initiated the medical clearance process.

Estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time for an average respondent to respond: 1,673 respondents, ½ hour average written response time. About 45 respondents will be requested to answer oral questions for a hour.

Estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with this collection: 881.5 hours.

This notice issued in Washington, DC on May 11, 2007.

Wilbert Bryant,

Associate Director for Management.

[FR Doc. 07–2324 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6015–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the following meeting during the week of May 14, 2007:

Closed Meetings will be held on

Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 2 p.m. and

Thursday, May 17, 2007 at 9:45 a.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the Closed Meetings. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters may also be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3), (5), (7), (9)(B), and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (7), 9(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the Closed Meetings.

Commissioner Atkins, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the closed meeting in closed session.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 15, 2007 will be:

Formal orders of investigations;

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions;

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature;

An adjudicatory matter; and

Other matters related to enforcement proceedings.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Thursday, May 17, 2007 will be:

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions; and

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature;

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items.

For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary at (202) 551–5400.

May 8, 2007.

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9181 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–55714; File No. SR–Amex–2007–43]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; American Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change Relating to a One-Year Extension of the $1 Strike Price Pilot Program

May 7, 2007.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on April 30, 2007, the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been substantially prepared by Amex. The Exchange has filed the proposal as a ''non-controversial'' rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange seeks to extend the $1 strike price pilot program (''Pilot Program'') for one year through June 5, 2008. The text of the proposed rule change is available at Amex, the Commission's Public Reference Room, and *http://www.amex.com*.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, Amex included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. Amex has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Pilot Program was established in June 2003,[5] with three one-year extensions granted by the Commission in June 2004, June 2005, and May 2006.[6] The Exchange believes that the Pilot Program has operated as designed, providing investors with greater flexibility in achieving their investment strategies in connection with stocks trading below $20. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that a one-year extension is reasonable and consistent with the intent of the Pilot Program.

The Pilot Program permits the Exchange to select a total of five individual stocks on which options series may be listed at $1 strike price intervals. To be eligible for the Pilot Program, an underlying stock must close below $20 on its primary market on the previous trading day. If selected, the Exchange may list $1 strike prices at $1 intervals from $3 to $20, however, a $1 strike price may not be listed that is greater than $5 from the underlying stock's closing price on its primary market on the previous day. The Exchange may also list $1 strikes on any other options class designated by another options exchange that employs a similar pilot program approved by the Commission.

The Pilot Program prohibits the Exchange from listing $1 strikes on any series of individual equity options classes that have greater than nine months until expiration. In addition, the Exchange is also restricted from listing any series that would result in strike prices being $0.50 apart.

To date, the Exchange believes that the Pilot Program has been beneficial to investors and the options market by providing investors with greater flexibility in the trading of equity options that overlie stocks trading below $20. In this manner, options investors are able to better tailor their strategies through the availability of $1 strikes. The Pilot Program Report, attached as Exhibit 3 to the proposal, provides data regarding the Pilot Program as required

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 48024 (June 12, 2003), 68 FR 36617 (June 18, 2003) (SR–Amex–2003–36) (''Pilot Approval Order'').

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 49813 (June 4, 2004), 69 FR 33088 (June 14, 2004) (SR–Amex–2004–45); 51770 (May 31, 2005), 70 FR 33226 (June 7, 2005) (SR–Amex–2005–40); and 53843 (May 19, 2006), 71 FR 30455 (May 26, 2006) (collectively, ''Pilot Program Extension Notices'').

in the Pilot Program Extension Notices.[7] Amex notes that, as the data indicates, the $1 strikes exhibited higher volume and open interest than the ''standard'' strike price intervals. Specifically, the five options classes selected by Amex for $1 strikes had a trading volume of 327,115 contracts, while the ''standard'' strikes for the same options classes had a trading volume 290,191 contracts. Of even greater significance is the difference in open interest between the $1 strikes and ''standard'' strikes. As of April 30, 2007, $1 strikes open interest totaled 685,808 contracts versus 396,777 contracts for ''standard'' strikes. Given the limited nature of the Pilot Program, the Exchange submits that the impact on systems has been minimal. Accordingly, Amex believes that an extension of the Pilot Program for one year through June 5, 2008, is warranted.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b) of the Act,[8] in general, and furthers the objective of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[9] in particular, in that it is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change will impose no burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in the furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing rule change does not: (1) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (2) impose any significant burden on competition; and (3) become operative for 30 days from the date of this filing, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[10] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[11]

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File No. SR–Amex–2007–43 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File No. SR–Amex–2007–43. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of Amex. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–Amex–2007–43 and should be submitted on or before June 1, 2007.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[12]

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9076 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[7] *See* Pilot Program Extension Notices, *supra* note 6.

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[9] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[11] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). Rule 19b–4(f)(6) also requires the self-regulatory organization to give the Commission notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change, along with a brief description and text of the proposed rule change, at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. Amex has satisfied the five-day pre-filing requirement. As set forth in the Commission's initial approval of the Pilot Program, if Amex proposes to: (1) Extend the Pilot Program; (2) expand the number of options eligible for inclusion in the Pilot Program; or (3) seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program, it must submit a Pilot Program report to the Commission along with the filing of its proposal to extend, expand, or seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program. Amex must file any proposal to expand or seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program and the Pilot Program report with the Commission at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the Pilot Program. The Pilot Program report must cover the entire time the Pilot Program was in effect and must include: (1) Data and written analysis on the open interest and trading volume for options (at all strike price intervals) selected for the Pilot Program; (2) delisted options series (for all strike price intervals) for all options selected for the Pilot Program; (3) an assessment of the appropriateness of $1 strike price intervals for the options Amex selected for the Pilot Program; (4) an assessment of the impact of the Pilot Program on the capacity of Amex's, the Options Price Reporting Authority's, and vendors' automated systems; (5) any capacity problems or other problems that arose during the operation of the Pilot Program and how Amex addressed them; (6) any complaints that Amex received during the operation of the Pilot Program and how Amex addressed them; and (7) any additional information that would help to assess the operation of the Pilot Program. *See* Pilot Approval Order, *supra* note 5.

[12] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–55715; File No. SR–ISE–2007–26]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; International Securities Exchange, LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Extend a Pilot Program That Allows the Listing of Strike Prices at One-Point Intervals for Stocks Trading Under $20

May 7, 2007.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2]

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

notice is hereby given that on April 30, 2007, the International Securities Exchange, LLC (''ISE'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been substantially prepared by ISE. The Exchange has filed the proposal as a ''non-controversial'' rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to extend until June 5, 2008, its $1 strike pilot program that allows the listing of strike prices at one-point intervals (''Pilot Program''). The text of the proposed rule change is available at ISE, the Commission's Public Reference Room, and *http://www.iseoptions.com*.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, ISE included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. ISE has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On June 16, 2003, the Commission approved ISE's Pilot Program, which allows ISE to list series with $1 strike price intervals on equity option classes that overlie up to five individual stocks, provided that the strike prices are $20 or less, but not less than $3.[5] The Pilot Program, after being extended on four prior occasions,[6] is set to expire on June 5, 2007.[7] The Exchange may currently select up to five individual stocks to be included in the Pilot Program. The Exchange, however, is also permitted to list options on other individual stocks at $1 strike price intervals if other options exchanges listed those series pursuant to their respective rules. The Exchange has selected the following five options classes to participate in the Pilot Program: AMR Corp. (AMR), Clapine Corp. (CPN), EMC Corp. (EMC), El Paso Corp. (EP), and Sun Microsystems Inc. (SUNW). ISE believes the Pilot Program has been successful and well received by its members and the investing public. Thus, ISE proposes to extend the Pilot Program until June 5, 2008.

In support of this proposed rule change, and as required by the Pilot Program Approval Order and the Pilot Extension Notices, the Exchange is submitting to the Commission a report (''Pilot Program Report''), attached as Exhibit 3 to the proposal, detailing the Exchange's experience with the Pilot Program. Specifically, the Pilot Program Report contains data and written analysis regarding the five options classes included in the Pilot Program for the period between March 2006 through February 2007.

The Exchange believes there is sufficient investor interest and demand to extend the Pilot Program for another year. The Exchange continues to believe that the Pilot Program has provided investors with greater trading opportunities and flexibility and the ability to more closely tailor their investment strategies and decisions to the movement of the underlying security. Furthermore, the Exchange has not detected any material proliferation of illiquid options series resulting from the narrower strike price intervals.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[8] Specifically, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements under Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [9] that the rules of a national securities exchange be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that extension of the Pilot Program will result in a continuing benefit to investors by allowing them to more closely tailor their investment decisions, and will allow the Exchange to further study investor interest in $1 strike price intervals.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change does not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in the furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any unsolicited written comments from members or other interested persons.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing rule change does not: (1) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (2) impose any significant burden on competition; and (3) become operative for 30 days from the date of this filing, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [10] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[11]

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 48033 (June 16, 2003), 68 FR 37036 (June 20, 2003) (SR–ISE–2003–17) (''Pilot Program Approval Order'').

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 49827 (June 8, 2004), 69 FR 33966 (June 17, 2004) (SR–ISE–2004–21); 50060 (July 22, 2004), 69 FR 45864 (July 30, 2004) (SR–ISE–2004–26); 51769 (May 31, 2005), 70 FR 33232 (June 07, 2005) (SR–ISE–2005–22); and 53806 (May 15, 2006), 71 FR 29694 (May 23, 2006) (SR–ISE–2006–20) (collectively, ''Pilot Extension Notices'').

[7] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 53806, *supra* note 6.

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[9] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[11] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). Rule 19b–4(f)(6) also requires the self-regulatory organization to give the Commission notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change, along with a brief description and text of the proposed rule change, at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. ISE has satisfied the five-day pre-filing requirement. As set forth in the Commission's initial approval of the Pilot Program, if ISE proposes to: (1) Extend the Pilot Program; (2) expand the number of options eligible for inclusion in the Pilot Program; or (3) seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program, it must submit a Pilot Program report to the Commission along with the filing of its proposal to extend, expand, or seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program. ISE must file any proposal to expand or seek permanent approval of the Pilot Program and the Pilot Program report with the Commission at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the Pilot Program. The Pilot Program report must cover the entire time the Pilot Program was in effect and must include: (1) Data and written analysis on the open interest and trading volume for options (at all strike price intervals) selected for the Pilot

Continued

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

• Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or

• Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File No. SR–ISE–2007–26 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

• Send paper comments in triplicate to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File No. SR–ISE–2007–26. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of ISE. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–ISE–2007–26 and should be submitted on or before June 1, 2007.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[12]

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9070 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

Program; (2) delisted options series (for all strike price intervals) for all options selected for the Pilot Program; (3) an assessment of the appropriateness of $1 strike price intervals for the options ISE selected for the Pilot Program; (4) an assessment of the impact of the Pilot Program on the capacity of ISE's, the Options Price Reporting Authority's, and vendors' automated systems; (5) any capacity problems or other problems that arose during the operation of the Pilot Program and how ISE addressed them; (6) any complaints that ISE received during the operation of the Pilot Program and how ISE addressed them; and (7) any additional information that would help to assess the operation of the Pilot Program. *See* Pilot Program Approval Order, *supra* note 5.

[12] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–55717; File No. SR–NASD–2007–029]

Self-Regulatory Organizations: National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Relating to Access Fee Display Requirements for the OTCBB

May 7, 2007.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on April 20, 2007, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been substantially prepared by NASD. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

NASD is proposing to amend NASD Rule 6540(c) to exclude from the access fee display requirements access fees below a specified level.

Below is the text of the proposed rule change. Proposed new language is in *italics;* proposed deletions are in brackets.

* * * * *

6540. Requirements Applicable to Market Makers

(a) through (b) No Change.

(c) A participating ATS or ECN shall reflect non-subscriber access or post-transaction fees in *its published quotation* [the ATS's or ECN's posted quoted] in the OTC Bulletin Board montage *if:*

(1) The published quotation is priced equal to or greater than $1.00 and such fees exceed or accumulate to more than $0.003 per share; or

(2) The published quotation is less than $1.00 and such fees exceed or accumulate to more than 0.3% of the published quotation price on a per share basis.

(d) through (e) No Change.

* * * * *

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, NASD included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. NASD has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

NASD Rule 6540(c) requires an alternative trading system (''ATS'')[3] or electronic communications network (''ECN'')[4] to reflect non-subscriber access or post-transaction fees in its posted quotation in the OTC Bulletin Board (''OTCBB''). NASD established the requirements in Rule 6540(c) to permit ATSs and ECNs to participate in the OTCBB in the same way that market makers participate.[5] Specifically, because a market maker does not charge access or post-transaction fees over and above its posted quotation, a participating ATS or ECN is prohibited from charging such fees, unless such fees are incorporated in the ATS's or ECN's posted quotation. Concerns have

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Rule 300(a) of Regulation ATS under the Act (defining ''alternative trading system'').

[4] *See* Rule 600(b)(23) of Regulation NMS under the Act (defining ''electronic communication network'').

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 45915 (May 10, 2002), 67 FR 35171 (May 17, 2002) (approving SR–NASD–2001–44).

been raised about the practical difficulties of complying with Rule 6540(c) for ATSs and ECNs that choose to charge such fees.

First, NASD Rule 2320(g)(2) requires a member that displays priced quotations for the same non-exchange-listed security [6] in two or more quotation mediums [7] that permit quotation updates on a real-time basis to display the same priced quotation in each system. NASD established this requirement because members that display differently priced quotations in different quotation mediums for the same security can be confusing and misleading to other market participants and, more importantly, to public investors.[8] Moreover, NASD believes that requiring that members display consistently priced quotations in multiple quotation mediums enhances the ability of other market participants to ascertain the best inter-dealer market for a security.[9]

Rule 2320(g)(2), in conjunction with Rule 6540(c), results in certain unintended consequences. Specifically, the effect of these rules is to require an ATS or ECN that charges an access fee to incorporate such access fee in its internal system quotation, notwithstanding the fact that internal subscribers of such system will not be charged that fee. NASD does not believe such a result furthers the goals of Rule 2320(g)(2) or Rule 6540(c).

Second, by requiring an ATS or ECN to incorporate its access fee in its quote, the ATS or ECN may be forced to effect two trades at different prices rather than one trade at a single price: (1) The transaction with the subscriber that placed the original limit order at the limit order price, with no access fee charged; and (2) the transaction with the non-subscriber at the quoted price inclusive of the access fee charged to the non-subscriber. This has the unintended consequence of requiring two separate trade reports to the tape at each price for what previously was reportable as one trade and may also require the ATS or ECN to trade on a principal basis to effectuate the trade.

In a prior rule filing (SR–NASD–2005–095) relating to restrictions on sub-penny quoting that was later withdrawn, NASD had proposed to eliminate Rule 6540(c), primarily because it was in direct conflict with the proposed sub-penny quotation restriction, given that most access fees are in sub-penny increments.[10] In the context of that filing, several commenters opposed the proposed elimination of the requirements in Rule 6540(c), generally raising concerns that such elimination would lead to hidden and unregulated access fees because the deletion of Rule 6540(c) eliminates the practical disincentive to charge excessive fees.

In response to both the concerns raised regarding the practical difficulties with compliance with Rule 6540(c) and that ATSs and ECNs might charge hidden and excessive access fees, NASD is proposing to amend Rule 6540(c) to exclude from the requirements only those access fees that are less than or equal to $0.003 per share (or 0.3% of the published quotation price on a per-share basis in the case of published quotations below $1.00 per share).[11] NASD believes this approach addresses the practical difficulties with incorporating the access fee in a quotation, while also addressing the concerns relating to possible excessive access fees raised by commenters in response to proposed rule change SR–NASD–2005–095.

In addition, NASD is proposing a non-substantive change to replace the term ''posted quote'' with the term ''published quotation.'' As noted above, the effective date of the proposed rule change would be the date of Commission approval. NASD would publish a *Notice to Members* announcing Commission approval no later than 30 days following any such approval.

2. Statutory Basis

NASD believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[12] which requires, among other things, that NASD rules must be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. NASD believes that the proposed rule change is a reasonable means to ensure that access fees over a specified level are transparent to the marketplace.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

NASD does not believe that the proposed rule change would result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments were neither solicited nor received. However, as noted previously, the Commission published for comment proposed rule change SR–NASD–2005–095 and several comments concerning access fees were received.[13] The comments are summarized above.

[6] The term ''non-exchange-listed security'' means any equity security that is not traded on any national securities exchange and does not include a ''restricted security,'' as defined by Commission Rule 144(a)(3) under the Securities Act of 1933, nor any security designated in the PORTAL Market, the Rule 6700 Series. *See* NASD Rule 6610(c).

[7] The term ''quotation medium'' means any inter-dealer quotation system or any publication or electronic communications network or other device that is used by brokers or dealers to make known to others their interest in transactions in any security, including offers to buy or sell at a stated price or otherwise, or invitations of offers to buy or sell. *See* NASD Rule 2320(g)(4). The term quotation medium includes, without limitation, the OTCBB, the Electronic Pink Sheets, an ATS, and an ECN.

[8] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43319 (September 21, 2000), 65 FR 58589 (September 29, 2000) (approving SR–NASD–00–20).

[9] *See id.*

[10] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 53024 (December 27, 2005), 71 FR 159 (January 3, 2006) (notice of filing of proposed rule change and Amendment No. 2 to SR–NASD–2005–095).

[11] The specified levels in this proposed rule change correspond to the access fees limits set forth in Rule 610(c) of Regulation NMS under the Act. Rule 610(c) of Regulation NMS, among other provisions, generally limits the fees that any trading center can charge (or allow to be charged) for accessing its protected quotation in an NMS stock priced equal to or greater than $1.00 per share to no more than $0.003 per share. If the price of a protected quotation is less than $1.00 per share, the fee cannot exceed 0.3% of the quotation price. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496 (June 29, 2005) (Regulation NMS Adopting Release).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[13] *See* Letter from Andrew B. Stevens, Assistant General Counsel, NYSE Group, Inc., and Greg O'Connor, Director of Compliance, Archipelago Trading Services, Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated February 14, 2007; Letter from Julian Rainero, on behalf of Pershing LLC, to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated March 6, 2006; Letter from Patrick E. Brake, Jr., General Counsel, Hill, Thompson, Magid & Co., Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated February 21, 2006; Letter from Jerry O'Connell, Chairman, Trading Committee, Securities Industry Association, to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated February 17, 2006; Letter from William Yancey, Chairman, and John C. Giesea, President and Chief Executive Officer, Security Traders Association, to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated February 8, 2006; Letter from R. Cromwell Coulson, Chief Executive Officer, Pink Sheets LLC, to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated January 26, 2006; Letter from Phylis M. Esposito, Executive Vice President, Chief Strategy Officer, Ameritrade, Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated January 24, 2006; Letter from Leonard J. Amoruso, Knight Capital Group, Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated January 24, 2006; Letter from Michael Santucci, President, Kimberly Unger, Executive Director, and Stephen J. Nelson, Co-Chair, Security Traders Association of New York, Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated January 24, 2006; Letter from Phylis M. Esposito, Executive Vice President, Chief Strategy Officer, Ameritrade, Inc., to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated October 31, 2005; and Letter from Kevin J. P. O'Hara, Chief Administrative Officer & General Counsel, Archipelago Trading Services, Inc., to Nancy M.

Continued

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 35 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

A. By order approve such proposed rule change, or

B. Institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

• Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or

• Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number SR–NASD–2007–029 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

• Send paper comments in triplicate to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASD–2007–029. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of NASD. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASD–2007–029 and should be submitted on or before June 1, 2007.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[14]

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9069 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

Morris, Secretary, Commission, dated September 23, 2005.

[14] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–55710; File No. SR–NFA–2007–03]

Self-Regulatory Organization; National Futures Association; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Amendments to Compliance Rule 2–9 (Supervision) and the Interpretive Notice Regarding Compliance Rule 2–9 (Enhanced Supervisory Requirements)

May 4, 2007.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(7) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–7 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on February 28, 2007, National Futures Association (''NFA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been substantially prepared by NFA. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons. NFA, on February 27, 2007, submitted the proposed rule change to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (''CFTC'') for approval. The CFTC approved the proposed rule change on March 28, 2007.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Description of the Proposed Rules

Section 15A(k) of the Act[3] makes NFA a national securities association for the limited purpose of regulating the activities of NFA members (''Members'') who are registered as brokers or dealers in security futures products under Section 15(b)(11) of the Exchange Act.[4] NFA's Interpretive Notice entitled ''Compliance Rule 2–9: Enhanced Supervisory Requirements'' (''Interpretive Notice'') applies to all Members who meet the criteria in the Interpretive Notice and could apply to Members registered under Section 15(b)(11).

The amendments to the Interpretive Notice:

• Expand the definition of a Disciplined Firm to include firms that have been sanctioned by the CFTC or NFA during the preceding five years for using deceptive telemarketing practices or promotional material, even if the firm was not barred from the industry; and

• Impose the enhanced supervisory requirements on firms that charge 50% or more of their customers round-turn commissions, fees, and other charges that total $100 or more per futures, forex, or option contract.

The amendment to Compliance Rule 2–9(b) adds language specifically authorizing NFA's Board to establish criteria related to the employment history of a Member's principals and/or to the amount of commissions, fees, and other charges assessed by a Member when imposing the enhanced supervisory requirements on a Member.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rules

NFA has prepared statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change, burdens on competition, and comments received from members, participants, and others. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. These statements are set forth in Sections A, B, and C below.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rules

1. Purpose

NFA's Board of Directors adopted the original Interpretive Notice in January 1993. The Interpretive Notice requires a Member to undertake specific enhanced supervisory requirements if its sales force includes a specified number of individuals who have worked at Disciplined Firms or, in certain situations, when a Member becomes subject to a disciplinary action.[5] The

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(7).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–7.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(k).

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(11).

[5] The Interpretive Notice currently provides that Member firms triggering the enhanced supervisory procedures must record all telephone conversations between the Member's APs and both existing and potential customers, submit all promotional

Interpretive Notice and an enabling provision of NFA Compliance Rule 2–9(b) provide that affected Members may petition the Telemarketing Procedures Waiver Committee for relief from these obligations.

NFA's Board has amended the Interpretive Notice on eleven different occasions since it was first issued. The amendments have been based on various changes affecting the membership and on practical lessons learned from administering the Interpretive Notice over the years. The various amendments have at times expanded the scope of the Interpretive Notice and, at other times, have granted relief to the membership in situations when conditions indicated that it was warranted. For example, amendments were made due to the emergence of security futures products; in response to Members that reorganize their business to avoid the enhanced supervisory requirements; and in recognition that some associated persons (''APs'') who worked at Disciplined Firms long ago and/or for a short time who do not appear to pose an extraordinary risk to the public.

a. Expansion of the Definition of Disciplined Firm

Members currently qualify for the enhanced supervisory requirements if they hire a prescribed percentage of APs and principals who previously worked at Disciplined Firms. Disciplined Firms are defined in the Interpretive Notice as firms that have been formally charged by either the CFTC or NFA with using deceptive telemarketing practices or promotional material and have been permanently barred from the industry as a result of those charges. Disciplined Firms also include firms that have been barred by the NASD or the SEC for fraud-related sales practices involving security futures products.

The amendments to the Interpretive Notice expand the definition of a Disciplined Firm beyond firms that have been permanently barred from the industry for sales practice or promotional material violations by adding firms that have been sanctioned in any way for those types of violations during the preceding five years. These amendments are consistent with the considerations cited by NFA's Board when it originally issued the Interpretive Notice in 1993 and are supported by information NFA gleaned in reviewing the firms that would be affected by the change.

When NFA's Board first established the enhanced supervisory requirements, it noted in the Interpretive Notice that when a firm is closed for fraudulent sales tactics, it is reasonable to believe that the training and supervision that it gave its APs was ''wholly inadequate or inappropriate.'' The Board stated further that:

> It is also reasonable to conclude that an AP who received inadequate or inappropriate training and supervision may have learned improper sales tactics, which he will carry with him to his next job. Therefore, the Board believes that a Member firm employing such a sales force must have stringent supervision procedures in place in order to ensure that the improper training its APs have previously received does not taint their sales efforts on behalf of the Member.

More than 140 former NFA Members are currently classified as Disciplined Firms. The amendments to the Interpretive Notice would add approximately 180 firms to the list of Disciplined Firms because they have received sanctions short of a permanent bar from the CFTC or NFA for sales practice and/or promotional material violations during the last five years.

Members that would be added as Disciplined Firms would not themselves become subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements merely because they are now categorized as Disciplined Firms. Rather, the effect of the proposal would be that their APs and principals would have to be counted by present and future sponsors as having worked at a Disciplined Firm for purposes of determining whether the sponsor's employee mix triggered an obligation to adopt the enhanced supervisory requirements. The overall effect of the reclassification of the individuals who worked for the firms that would be added to the Disciplined Firm list under the proposal would be to obligate approximately forty-five additional active Members to adopt the enhanced supervisory requirements. By comparison, ten Members became subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements during 2005 and thirty-nine Members became subject to the requirements in 2006.[6]

NFA's review of the disciplinary histories of the additional Members that would become subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements indicates that they have an incidence of disciplinary actions that far outstrips the industry average for sales practice and promotional material violations. In fact, eleven of these firms have already been subject to NFA or the CFTC actions alleging abusive sales practices and/or misleading promotional material. Based on the disciplinary history of these firms and the employment histories of their principals and APs, it is reasonable to conclude that they would benefit from the enhanced supervisory requirements ''to ensure that the improper training [the firm's] APs have previously received does not taint their sales efforts on behalf of the Member.''

b. Imposition of Enhanced Supervisory Requirements Based on Commissions and Fees

NFA has also recently reviewed whether it is appropriate to impose the enhanced supervisory requirements on the few Members that charge commissions and fees that are substantially in excess of the normal range assessed by the general membership. NFA staff has reviewed the commission and fee structures of a number of Member firms which have been subject to disciplinary action and arbitration claims during recent years and has found that a significant correlation exists between firms that are cited as respondents in actions for misleading sales practices and firms that charge abnormally high commissions and fees.

NFA reviewed the commission rates charged by Member firms that have been cited by the Business Conduct Committee for misleading sales practices over the last three years. All but one of the approximately twenty firms included in the group charged total round-turn commissions, mark-ups, fees, and other charges of between $95 and $250 per futures, forex, or option contract—with the strong majority of the firms skewing toward the high end of that range.

In addition, NFA reviewed arbitration claims to determine if there was any correlation between claims and high commission rates. Five of the twelve firms that have been subject to the highest number of claims are small-to-medium-sized firms that charge commissions that compare to the high rates described above. Many of the claims against those firms included allegations of misleading sales practices.[7]

The correlation between charging abnormally high commissions and fees

material at least ten days prior to first use, adopt written supervisory procedures, and either operate under a guarantee agreement or maintain at least $250,000 in adjusted net capital (''ANC'').

[6] The increase in 2006 is largely attributable to the impact of revisions made to the Interpretive Notice in early 2006 and to adding a number of Members to the list of Disciplined Firms when charges against them were resolved with permanent bars.

[7] Six large firms that charge commissions that are in line with industry norms are among the twelve Members that have been subject to the most arbitration claims made over the past three years. This is not surprising based on their size.

and allegations of sales practice fraud suggests that firms that charge commissions that are significantly in excess of industry norms would benefit from the enhanced supervisory requirements. In particular, recording conversations with the public would give affected Members the opportunity to ensure that misrepresentations and failure to disclose costs would be detected and, hopefully, corrected.

Based on this information, the Board amended the Interpretive Notice to impose the enhanced supervisory requirements on any Member firm that charges 50% or more of its active customers round-turn commissions, fees, and other charges that total $100 or more per futures, forex, or option contract.[8] In setting the amount of commissions at this level, NFA relied upon feedback from NFA's Advisory Committees and Joint Audit Committee representatives, and used data obtained in NFA's examinations of Member firms. This feedback suggests that Members that charge commissions and fees below this level are less likely to engage in fraudulent sales practices.

The amended Interpretive Notice imposes a duty on Members to notify NFA if they charge round-turn commissions, fees, and other charges that reach the triggering levels specified in the Interpretive Notice. In addition, upon inquiry by NFA, Members have the burden of demonstrating that they do not meet the triggering levels. The amendments to the Interpretive Notice add the reasonableness of commissions and the effectiveness of any disclosure to customers regarding them to the list of factors that the Telemarketing Procedures Waiver Committee may consider in evaluating a waiver request.

c. Exemptions for Certain Associated Persons

The Interpretive Notice exempts two groups of APs who have previously worked at Disciplined Firms from being counted for purposes of calculating whether their current employer's sales force triggers the enhanced supervisory requirements. NFA's analysis shows that, in general, the APs covered by the exemptions do not pose a greater threat to the public than the overall population of APs.

The first exempt group was created in 2003 and includes APs who worked for Disciplined Firms for less than 60 days and who have not been employed by any Disciplined Firm during the preceding five years. The second exempt group was created in April of 2006 and includes APs who worked at a single Disciplined Firm more than ten years ago and who have not worked for a Member that has been subject to any sales practice action by NFA or the CFTC since leaving the Disciplined Firm. The Interpretive Notice provides that those APs must not have been personally subject to disciplinary action by NFA or the CFTC. The amendments to the Interpretive Notice require APs who fall into the first exempt group to be treated consistently with those in the second group by also requiring them to be free from personal disciplinary action by NFA or the CFTC.

d. Enhanced Adjusted Net Capital Requirement

The Interpretive Notice currently requires all Members that are subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements to either operate pursuant to a guarantee agreement or to maintain ANC of at least $250,000, which has historically been the benchmark amount for FCMs required under NFA Financial Requirements. Revisions to NFA's Financial Requirements that raised the ANC requirements for Forex Dealer Members (''FDMs'') to $1,000,000 and for other FCMs to $500,000 became effective on July 31, 2006—thus rendering the current Interpretive Notice outdated as it applies to the ANC requirements for those Members. The ANC requirement for IBs was raised from $30,000 to $45,000 at the same time, but the new IB levels are still much less than the $250,000 required under the Interpretive Notice.

The revised Interpretive Notice imposes an ANC requirement of $2,000,000 on FDMs and $1,000,000 on other FCMs that are subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements. The Interpretive Notice also makes it clear that the $250,000 increased ANC requirement applies to CTAs and CPOs as well as IBs.

e. Miscellaneous Amendments

In giving the option to Members that qualify for the enhanced supervisory procedures to either operate under a guarantee agreement or maintain at least $250,000 in ANC, the current language of the Interpretive Notice limits the pool of potential guarantors to FCMs that meet the eligibility requirements for executing a Supplemental Guarantor Certification Statement (''SGCS'') pursuant to NFA Registration Rule 504(a)(2)(B). Changes have been made to NFA's Registration Rules since the inclusion of the reference to NFA Registration Rule 504(a)(2)(B) in the Interpretive Notice and, in fact, the Registration Rule provision cited in the Interpretive Notice no longer exists. A technical amendment to the Interpretive Notice deletes the reference to defunct NFA Registration Rule 504(a)(2)(B) and replaces it with a reference to NFA Registration Rule 509(b)(5), which contains comparable provisions for eligibility to execute an SGCS.

Most Members that are required to record conversations with customers use standard format audio cassette recordings or commonly used digital recording programs. However, there have been several instances in which Members have provided recordings to NFA that are in outdated or exotic media formats. NFA has occasionally had to go to extraordinary lengths in order to hear and understand the contents of some of those recordings. In one case, NFA Compliance staff auditors had to travel to the FBI facility at Quantico, Virginia to listen to tapes because the FBI had one of the few machines capable of playing back recordings produced by a Member and the firm had represented that its outdated machinery was irreparably damaged. The amended Interpretive Notice requires Members subject to enhanced supervisory requirements to promptly provide NFA or the CFTC with the appropriate resources for listening to the recording upon request. Obviously, such a request would be rare but the addition would be of great benefit in certain circumstances and would likely encourage affected Members to use standard media formats in the first place.

NFA Compliance Rule 2–9(b) authorizes NFA's Board to establish criteria for becoming subject to the enhanced supervisory requirements. The existing rule explicitly authorizes the Board to establish those criteria based on the employment history of a firm's APs but does not mention either the employment history of a Member's principals or the amount of commissions, fees and other charges assessed by a Member. The amendments to the rule add this language.

2. Statutory Basis

NFA has filed these proposed regulations pursuant to Section 19(b)(7) of the Act.[9] The rule change is authorized by, and consistent with, Section 15A(k) of the Act.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The rule change will not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance

[8] The term ''active customers'' means any customers who are entitled to a monthly statement under the provisions of CFTC Regulations § 1.33(a).

[9] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(7).

of the purposes of the Act and the Commodity Exchange Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rules Received From Members, Participants, or Others

NFA did not publish the rule change to the membership for comment but did discuss it with NFA's FCM, IB and CPO/CTA Advisory Committees. NFA did not receive comment letters concerning the rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rules and Timing for Commission Action

On February 27, 2007, NFA submitted the proposed amendments to NFA's Compliance Rule 2–9 and the Interpretive Notice to the CFTC for approval. The proposed rule change has become effective on March 28, 2007, the date of approval of the proposed rule change by the CFTC.

Within 60 days of the date of effectiveness of the proposed rule change, the Commission, after consultation with the CFTC, may summarily abrogate the proposed rule change and require that the proposed rule change be refiled in accordance with the provisions of Section 19(b)(1) of the Exchange Act.[10]

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–NFA–2007–03 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NFA–2007–03. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NFA–2007–03 and should be submitted on or before June 1, 2007.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[11]

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9071 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[11] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–55716; File No. SR–OCC–2006–15]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; The Options Clearing Corporation; Order Granting Approval of a Proposed Rule Change Relating to the Approval of Fund Shares Deposited as Margin

May 7, 2007.

I. Introduction

On August 31, 2006, The Options Clearing Corporation (''OCC'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') proposed rule change SR–OCC–2006–15 pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'').[1] Notice of the proposal was published in the **Federal Register** on March 29, 2007.[2] No comment letters were received. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission is granting approval of the proposed rule change.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 55504 (March 21, 2007), 72 FR 14844.

II. Description

The proposed rule change eliminates the requirement that OCC's Membership/Risk Committee approve classes of fund shares (*e.g.*, ETFs) for deposit as margin. It deletes Interpretation and Policy .11 to Rule 604, Forms of Margin, which requires that OCC's Membership/Risk Committee approve classes of fund shares for deposit as margin. Committee approval was deemed to be a prudent safeguard when OCC began accepting fund shares for deposit in 1997 because fund shares had only been trading since 1993, and OCC was not as familiar with them as it is today.[3] In 1998, OCC began clearing options on fund shares.[4] Since then, fund shares have become a widely used investment tool, and OCC has developed a broad understanding of the fund share marketplace. In light of these developments, OCC believes that fund shares should be accepted as margin under the same conditions that apply to the deposit of other equity securities without the need for Committee approval.

III. Discussion

Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act requires, among other things, that the rules of a clearing agency be designed to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds which are in its custody or control or for which it is responsible.[5] OCC's Rule 604 provides that OCC may accept cash, letters of credit, and certain types of liquid securities. In our approval order of the 1997 proposed rule change to allow OCC to accept fund shares as margin, we noted that fund shares are typically traded and cleared like common stock and are typically held in book-entry form at a securities depository in which OCC can readily perfect a security interest.[6] Given the liquid nature of fund shares and OCC's increased experience with evaluating the risks associated with fund shares, we are satisfied with OCC's determination that it is no longer necessary for its Membership/Risk Committee to approve classes of fund shares before the fund shares can be deposited as margin. Accordingly, the proposed rule should not affect OCC's obligation to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds which are in its

[3] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39104 (September 22, 1997), 62 FR 50647 (September 29, 1997) (File No. SR–OCC–97–01).

[4] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40132 (June 25, 1998), 63 FR 36467 (July 6, 1998) (File No. SR–OCC–97–02).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(F).

[6] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39104 (September 22, 1997), 62 FR 50647 (September 29, 1997) (File No. SR–OCC–97–01).

custody or control or for which it is responsible.

IV. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and in particular Section 17A of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder.[7]

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, that the proposed rule change (File No. SR–OCC–2006–15) be and hereby is approved.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[8]

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9086 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Aviation Proceedings, Agreements Filed the Week Ending April 27, 2007

The following Agreements were filed with the Department of Transportation under the Sections 412 and 414 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1383 and 1384) and procedures governing proceedings to enforce these provisions. Answers may be filed within 21 days after the filing of the application.

Docket Number: OST–2007–28027.
Date Filed: April 23, 2007.
Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.
Subject: Mail Vote 534—Resolution 010q, TC3/TC23 Special Passenger Amending, Resolution from Sri Lanka, (Memo 1084), Intended effective date: 1 May 2007.

Docket Number: OST–2007–28038.
Date Filed: April 24, 2007.
Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.
Subject: PSC/RESO/137 dated March 20, 2007, Finally Adopted Resolutions & Recommended Practices, PSC/MINS/019 dated March 20, 2007, Intended effective date: 1 June 2007.

Renee V. Wright,

Program Manager, Docket Operations, Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. E7–9081 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–9X–P

[7] In approving the proposed rule change, the Commission considered the proposal's impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[8] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Notice of Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits Filed Under Subpart B (Formerly Subpart Q) During the Week Ending April 27, 2007

The following Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits were filed under Subpart B (formerly Subpart Q) of the Department of Transportation's Procedural Regulations (See 14 CFR 301.201 *et seq.*). The due date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motions to Modify Scope are set forth below for each application. Following the Answer period DOT may process the application by expedited procedures. Such procedures may consist of the adoption of a show-cause order, a tentative order, or in appropriate cases a final order without further proceedings.

Docket Number: OST–2007–27060.
Date Filed: April 24, 2007.
Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: May 15, 2007
Description: Application of Zoom Airlines Limited, amending its exemption and foreign air carrier permit to add a request for authority to serve Bermuda (''BRA'') as an intermediate point on its proposed scheduled service between London Gatwick Airport (''LGW'') and John F. Kennedy International Airport (''JFK'').

Docket Number: OST–2007–28046.
Date Filed: April 24, 2007.
Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: May 15, 2007
Description: Application of Air Executive Charter GmbH (''Air Executive Charter''), requesting an exemption and a foreign air carrier permit authorizing Air Executive Charter to provide the following service using small aircraft: (a) Charter foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail between any point or points in Germany and any point or points in the United States; and between any point or points in the United States and any point or points in a third country or countries, provided that such service constitutes part of a continuous operation, with or without a change of aircraft, that includes air service to Germany for the purpose of carrying local traffic between Germany and the United States; (b) effective March 30, 2008, charter foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail from points behind EU Member States, via the EU Member States and intermediate points to any point or points in the United States and beyond; (c) effective March 30, 2008, charter foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail between any point or points in the United States and any point or points in the European Common Aviation Area (''ECAA''); and (d) other charters between non-EU/ECAA third countries and the United States.

Docket Number: OST–2007–28073.
Date Filed: April 27, 2007.
Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: May 18, 2007.
Description: Application of Star Air A/S, requesting an exemption and a foreign air carrier permit to provide charter foreign air transportation of property and mail on any and all routes authorized pursuant to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Denmark Relating to Air Transport Services (''U.S.-Denmark Open Skies Agreement'').

Docket Number: OST–2007–28087.
Date Filed: April 27, 2007.
Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: May 18, 2007.
Description: Application of ABX Air, Inc. (''ABX''), requesting the Department of Transportation disclaim jurisdiction over the transfer of the certificate of public convenience and necessity and other operating authority issued to ABX to facilitate the formation by ABX of a holding company.

Renee V. Wright,

Program Manager, Docket Operations, Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. E7–9080 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–9X–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

[Docket No. FHWA–2007–28076]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Notice of Request for Reinstatement of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval Has Expired

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Request for Reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

SUMMARY: The FHWA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's

(OMB) approval for reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired: It is summarized below under Supplementary Information. We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Please submit comments by July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by DOT DMS Docket Number FHWA–2007–28076 by any of the following methods:

- *Web Site: http://dms.dot.gov*. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.
- *Fax:* 1–202–493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *http://dms.dot.gov* at any time or to Room 401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather Contrino, 202–366–5060, or Ralph Gillman, 202–366–5042, Office of Highway Policy Information, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: National Household Travel Survey.

OMB Control #: 2125–0545.

Background: The collection of passenger travel data is authorized in The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users of 2005 (SAFETEA–LU) in Title 49, U.S.C. 301. In addition, Title 23, Section 307 authorizes the DOT to engage in studies to collect data for planning future highway programs.

The 2008 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) will provide an updated benchmark of travel activity and a measure of the impact of household travel behavior on system performance including safety, accessibility, economic factors, and congestion. This continuity is important in identifying, assessing, and forecasting travel trends.

The many changes in travel and the related social patterns point to the need for a 2008 NHTS. Continuing changes in household structure, commuting levels and patterns, the location of households and workplaces, and increases in the mobility of the older population, as well as issues of air quality and traffic congestion, have all resulted in significant changes in travel in recent years.

Historically, FHWA has had the responsibility for the administration of the NHTS. FHWA coordinates with other agencies within the DOT on information needs and program applications. The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have provided supplemental funding in past NHTS program activities. In addition, several organizations outside DOT rely on the NHTS for transportation information relating to health (Centers for Disease Control), energy consumption (Energy Information Administration), and emergency planning (Department of Homeland Security). The Department of Transportation has a continuing need for current and improved data to determine the nature and extent of present travel needs and to plan for meeting the nation's travel needs of the future. Specifically, data is needed to:

- Examine the availability and use of transportation to various population groups, including those whose mobility has historically been lower than that of the general population, such as the elderly, low-income, people of color, and new immigrants;
- Identify factors affecting the use of private vehicles and other means of transportation as they relate to trip purposes including travel to work, school, shopping, medical care and other personal business, and social and recreational travel;
- Forecast trends in highway transportation in light of projected demographic changes;
- Obtain the public's response to changes in transportation systems and services;
- Evaluate factors relating to the safety of the surface transportation system;
- Provide data for the evaluation of the impacts of various policy initiatives; and
- Provide cost-effective information that supports transportation planning and decision-making by Federal, State, and local governments.

The DOT uses the data to analyze the amount and nature of household travel, the relationship between socio-economic characteristics and travel patterns, and trends in passenger travel. Because demographic information is collected on each person and each household surveyed in the NHTS, the dataset is excellent for describing travel behavior of population groups. The transportation community has seen the influence of changes in travel behavior on the amount and type of travel demand, including the increasing participation of women in the workforce, trip chaining for other purposes as part of the work journey, an increase in single-occupant vehicles, and increased development of the outer suburbs and exurbs, and changes in household structure. NHTS is also critical in assessing emerging travel roles of older populations and how this is changing over time, as the older cohort is more and more composed of those who have grown up driving.

Understanding household travel today means understanding the complexity and variety of travel needs under these changing conditions. As our society addresses air quality and congestion issues, it is vital that the various trends be understood along with their implications for the different segments of the population.

Respondents: Approximately 25,000 households will complete the survey. The survey households will be selected using random digit dialing (RDD). The NHTS is a 2-stage study. In the first stage, households are contacted via computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) to collect basic information about the household and its vehicles. During this initial contact, households are recruited to participate in the diary phase (stage 2) of the study. Each household is assigned a specific travel day and asked to record details about each trip taken on that day. The stage 2 trip information is obtained via computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI).

Frequency: The NHTS has been conducted by the DOT every 5–7 years since 1969. The 2008 NHTS will be conducted during calendar year 2008.

Estimated Average Burden per Response: The estimated burden per household averages 68 minutes, which includes interviewing an average of 2.5 persons per household. The burden per person averages 20 minutes for the interview and another 7 minutes for keeping the diary.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: The estimated total annual burden hours are 28,333.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is

necessary for the FHWA's performance; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burdens; (3) ways for the FHWA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized, including the use of electronic technology, without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 23 U.S.C. 307; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued On: May 4, 2007.

James R. Kabel,

Chief, Management Programs and Analysis Division.

[FR Doc. E7–9064 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA–07–3]

Hazardous Materials: Reducing the Risk of Hazardous Materials Incidents During Loading and Unloading Operations

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public workshop on loading/unloading practices.

SUMMARY: As part of PHMSA's efforts to review bulk loading and unloading of hazardous materials and to develop risk reduction strategies, the agency invites interested persons to participate in a public workshop that will examine industry data, identify industry best practices and standards, discuss the role of recommended practices for loading and unloading, and consider industry actions that have the potential to reduce risk during loading and unloading. PHMSA seeks the broadest participation of industry, federal agencies, state and local government, standards organizations, the emergency response community, employee groups, environmental and public interest organizations, and the public. PHMSA seeks individuals and organizations willing to speak at the public workshop. Interested persons are invited to submit papers on related topics.

DATES: *Public meeting*: June 14, 2007, starting at 9 a.m.

ADDRESSES: *Public meeting:* The meeting will be held at Lowe's L'Enfant Plaza Hotel, 480 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, DC 20024. For information on the facilities or to request special accommodations at the meeting, please contact Mr. Rick Boyle by telephone or e-mail as soon as possible.

Written Comments: Written comments may be submitted and identified by DOT DMS Docket Number PHMSA–07–3 by any of the following methods:

- *Web site: http://dms.dot.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.
- *Fax:* 1–202–493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Rick Boyle, Office of Hazardous Materials Technology, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Technology, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, phone number: (202) 366–4545, e-mail: *rick.boyle@dot.gov*, or, Mr. Douglas Reeves, Office of Hazardous Materials Technology, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Technology, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, phone number: (202) 366–4545, e-mail: *douglas.reeves@dot.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A recent PHMSA review of bulk loading and unloading incidents over the past decade suggests roughly one quarter to one half of overall hazardous materials transportation incidents may be attributable to loading and unloading operations, particularly bulk packages. We also note that a significant proportion of National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) hazardous materials accident reports over this period address safety concerns regarding bulk loading or unloading operations.

II. Purpose of Public Workshop

PHMSA is using an enterprise approach, bringing all stakeholders together for conceptual discussions, to examine the bulk loading and unloading issue and the range of potential industry actions to reduce risk in the transportation of hazardous materials. This public workshop is an early step in this effort.

The workshop will consist of a series of panel presentations on specific topics followed by discussions of the issues involved. We anticipate that the panels will cover incident data and relevant NTSB accident reports; loading and unloading procedures, including existing recommended practices and potential gaps; assessment; training; and emergency response. An ad-hoc industry working group has submitted a draft recommended practice on contents of bulk loading and unloading procedures. PHMSA encourages all stakeholders to review the draft available in the docket as a starting point for discussions.

The public may attend and participate in this workshop without prior notification; however, to structure the event to best utilize technical experience in attendance, PHMSA asks that individuals submit information, if possible, on their areas of expertise and interests prior to the workshop. Individuals who wish to make presentations on the panels should contact Mr. Rick Boyle or Mr. Douglas Reeves and make arrangements to participate on the panels prior to the workshop. PHMSA plans to invite specific individuals and Federal agency representatives to make presentations as the workshop agenda is developed.

Advance material that should be reviewed prior to the workshop can be found in the docket or at *http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/meetings.* Directions to the workshop location, the workshop agenda, an attendee information submittal form, and the draft recommended practice on contents of bulk loading and unloading procedures can be found at these locations.

PHMSA also invites interested persons who are unable to attend the public workshop and who have an interest in bulk loading and unloading of hazardous materials to submit comments pertinent to panels and topics identified in the workshop agenda or to provide any relevant information or data to the DOT Docket Management System Docket Number PHMSA–07–3. Comments may be submitted by any method noted in the **ADDRESSES** section above.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 7, 2007, under authority delegated in 49 CFR part 106.

Theodore L. Willke,

Acting Associate Administrator for Hazardous Materials Safety.

[FR Doc. E7–9066 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB–511 (Sub-No. 3X)]

Central Railroad Company of Indianapolis—Discontinuance of Service Exemption—in Grant County, IN

On April 23, 2007, Central Railroad Company of Indianapolis (CERA) filed with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) a petition under 49 U.S.C. 10502 for exemption from the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 10903 to discontinue service over a 2.36-mile line of railroad between milepost TS–154.65, near Marion, and milepost TS–157.01, near West Marion Belt, in Grant County, IN.[1] The line traverses U.S. Postal Service Zip Codes 46952 and 46953, and does not include any stations.

The line does not contain Federally granted rights-of-way. Any documentation in CERA's possession will be made available promptly to those requesting it.

The interest of railroad employees will be protected by the conditions set forth in *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen,* 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979).

By issuing this notice, the Board is instituting an exemption proceeding pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10502(b). A final decision will be issued by August 10, 2007.

Any offer of financial assistance (OFA) to subsidize continued rail service under 49 CFR 1152.27(b)(2) will be due no later than 10 days after service of a decision granting the petition for exemption. Each OFA must be accompanied by a $1,300 filing fee. *See* 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25).[2]

All filings in response to this notice must refer to STB Docket No. AB–511 (Sub-No. 3X) and must be sent to: (1) Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001; and (2) Louis E. Gitomer, Esq., 600 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 301, Towson, MD 21204. Replies to the petition are due on or before May 31, 2007.

Persons seeking further information concerning discontinuance procedures may contact the Board's Office of Public Services at (202) 245–0230 or refer to the full abandonment and discontinuance regulations at 49 CFR part 1152. Questions concerning environmental issues may be directed to the Board's Section of Environmental Analysis at (202) 245–0305. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.]

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at *http://www.stb.dot.gov.*

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Decided: May 4, 2007.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9002 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

[1] CERA operates the line under trackage rights granted to it by Norfolk Southern Railway Company.

[2] Because this is a discontinuance of service proceeding and not an abandonment, trail use/rail banking and public use conditions are not appropriate. Similarly, no environmental or historic documentation is required under 49 CFR 1105.6(c)(2) and 1105.8(e).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 35020]

Northern and Bergen Railroad, L.L.C.—Acquisition Exemption—a Line of Railroad Owned by New York & Greenwood Lake Railway

Northern and Bergen Railroad, L.L.C. (NBR), a noncarrier, has filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to acquire (by purchase) 1.1 miles of rail line from the New York & Greenwood Lake Railway. The line to be acquired extends from milepost 0.0, at or near the connection with the track of Norfolk Southern Railway Company in the Borough of Garfield, Bergen County, NJ, to milepost 1.1, at or near the intersection of South and Fourth Streets in the City of Passaic, Passaic County, NJ.

NBR certifies that the projected annual freight revenues as a result of this transaction will not exceed the amounts that would qualify it as a Class III railroad.

The earliest this transaction may be consummated is May 26, 2007, the effective date of the exemption (30 days after the exemption was filed). NBR indicates that it intends to consummate the transaction on or before May 31, 2007, but not before May 26, 2007.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction. Petitions for stay must be filed no later than May 18, 2007 (at least 7 days before the exemption becomes effective).

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 35020, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Jeffrey O. Moreno, Esq., Thompson Hine LLP, 1920 N Street, NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036–1600.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at *http://www.stb.dot.gov*.

Decided: May 4, 2007.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–9114 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Thrift Supervision

Submission for OMB Review; comment request—CRA Sunshine

AGENCY: Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. OTS is soliciting public comments on the proposal.

DATES: Submit written comments on or before June 11, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, referring to the collection by title of the proposal or by OMB approval number, to OMB and OTS at these addresses: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Desk Officer for OTS, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 725—17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, or by fax to (202) 395–6974; and Information Collection Comments, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of Thrift Supervision, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552, by fax to (202) 906–6518, or by e-mail to *infocollection.comments@ots.treas.gov.* OTS will post comments and the related index on the OTS Internet Site at *http://www.ots.treas.gov.* In addition, interested persons may inspect comments at the Public Reading Room, 1700 G Street, NW., by appointment. To make an appointment, call (202) 906–5922, send an e-mail to *public.info@ots.treas.gov,* or send a facsimile transmission to (202) 906–7755.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information or to obtain a copy of the submission to OMB, please contact Marilyn K. Burton at *marilyn.burton@ots.treas.gov,* (202) 906–6467, or facsimile number (202) 906–6518, Litigation Division, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of Thrift Supervision, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OTS may not conduct or sponsor an information collection, and respondents are not required to respond to an information collection, unless the information collection displays a currently valid OMB control number. As part of the approval process, we invite comments on the following information collection.

Title of Proposal: CRA Sunshine.

OMB Number: 1550–0105.

Form Number: N/A.

Regulation requirement: 12 CFR part 533.

Description: This submission covers an extension of OTS's currently approved information collection contained in 12 CFR part 533. The submission involves no change to the regulations or to the information collection requirements.

The information collection requirements contained in the regulations are as follows:

Section 533.6(b)(1) requires each nongovernmental entity or person (NGEP) and each insured depository institution (IDI) or affiliate that enters into a covered agreement to make a copy of the covered agreement available to any individual or entity upon request.

Section 533.6(c)(1) requires each NGEP that is a party to a covered agreement to provide within 30 days after receiving a request from the relevant supervisory agency (1) a complete copy of the agreement; and (2) in the event the NGEP seeks confidential treatment of any portion of the agreement under FOIA, a copy of the agreement that excludes information for which confidential treatment is sought and an explanation justifying the request.

Sections 533.6(d)(1)(i) and 533.6(d)(1)(ii) require each IDI or affiliate within 60 days of the end of each calendar quarter to provide each supervisory agency with either (1) a complete copy of each covered agreement entered into by the IDI or affiliate during the calendar quarter; and in the event the IDI or affiliate seeks confidential treatment of any portion of the agreement under FOIA, a copy of the agreement that excludes information for which confidential treatment is sought and an explanation justifying the request; or (2) a list of all covered agreements entered into by the IDI or affiliate during the calendar quarter.

Section 533.6(d)(2) requires an IDI or affiliate to provide any relevant supervisory agency with a complete copy and public version of any covered agreement, if the IDI or affiliate submits a list of its covered agreements pursuant to § 533.6(d)(1)(ii).

Section 533.7(b) requires each NGEP and IDI or affiliate that is a party to a covered agreement to file an annual report with each relevant supervisory agency concerning the disbursement, receipt, and uses of funds or other resources under the covered agreement.

Section 533.7(f)(2)(ii) requires an IDI or affiliate that receives an annual report from a NGEP pursuant to § 533.7(f)(2)(i) to file the report with the relevant supervisory agency or agencies on behalf of the NGEP within 30 days.

Section 533.4(b) requires an IDI or affiliate that is party to a covered agreement that concerns any activity described in § 533.4(a) of a CRA affiliate to notify each NGEP that is a party to the agreement that the agreement concerns a CRA affiliate.

Current Actions

The current estimate is based on the actual number of IDIs or their affiliates that reported covered agreements to the agencies in 2004 and 2005. The number of NGEP respondents is based on an assumption that one NGEP is a party to each covered agreement.

Type of Review: Renewal.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit; individuals.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 12 IDI; 1 NGEP.

Estimated Number of Responses: 842.

Estimated Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Burden: 439 hours.

Clearance Officer: Marilyn K. Burton, (202) 906–6467, Office of Thrift Supervision, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552.

OMB Reviewer: Desk Officer for OTS, Fax: (202) 395–6974, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 725—17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: May 7, 2007.

Deborah Dakin,

Senior Deputy Chief Counsel, Regulations and Legislation Division.

[FR Doc. E7–9133 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

United States Mint

Notification of United States Mint Coin Product Price Adjustments

SUMMARY: The United States Mint is increasing prices for the 2007 American Eagle Platinum Proof and Uncirculated Coins.

The United States Mint is increasing the prices for 2007 American Eagle Platinum Proof and Uncirculated Coins effective with these products' release date, scheduled for May 17, 2007. The price increase from last year is due to higher platinum metal costs. The new prices are effective May 17, 2007, when the United States Mint will commence selling the 2007 American Eagle Platinum Coins at the prices indicated below:

Product	New 2007 price
2007 One Ounce Platinum Proof Coin	$1,599.95
2007 One-Half Ounce Platinum Proof Coin	809.95
2007 One-Quarter Ounce Platinum Proof Coin	439.95
2007 One-Tenth Ounce Platinum Proof Coin	229.95
2007 Four-Coin Platinum Proof Set	2,949.95
2007 One Ounce Platinum Uncirculated Coin	1,489.95
2007 One-Half Ounce Platinum Uncirculated Coin	759.95
2007 One-Quarter Ounce Platinum Uncirculated Coin	399.95
2007 One-Tenth Ounce Platinum Uncirculated Coin	189.95
2007 Four-Coin Platinum Uncirculated Set	2,769.95

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gloria Eskridge, Associate Director for Sales and Marketing; United States Mint; 801 Ninth Street, NW.; Washington, DC 20220; or call 202–354–7500.

Authority: 31 U.S.C. 5111, 5112 & 9701.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Edmund C. Moy,

Director, United States Mint.

[FR Doc. E7–9135 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–02–P

Corrections

Federal Register

Vol. 72, No. 91

Friday, May 11, 2007

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains editorial corrections of previously published Presidential, Rule, Proposed Rule, and Notice documents. These corrections are prepared by the Office of the Federal Register. Agency prepared corrections are issued as signed documents and appear in the appropriate document categories elsewhere in the issue.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Surplus Properties; Notice

Correction

In notice document 07–2262 beginning on page 26080 in the issue of Tuesday, May 8, 2007, make the following corrections:

1. On page 26081, in the first column, in the fifth line, ''*Attn:* BAIM–BD'' should read ''*Attn:* DAIM–BD ''.

2. On the same page, in the same column, in the eighth line, ''a specified property'' should read ''a specific property''.

3. On the same page, in the same column, under the heading **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, in the seventh line from the bottom of the paragraph, ''at the e-mail address'' should read ''at the mail or e-mail address''.

4. On the same page, in the same column, in the same paragraph, in the fourth line from the bottom of the paragraph, ''these of any'' should read ''these or any''.

5. On the same page, in the same column, under the heading *Arkansas*, in the second line, ''Highway 79 NW'' should read ''Highway 79 NE''.

6. On the same page, in the second column, under the heading **Authority**, in the second line from the bottom of the paragraph, ''Pub. L. 103–106'' should read ''Pub. L. 103–160''.

[FR Doc. C7–2262 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico, Mission Master Plan Final Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Correction

In notice document 07–2263 beginning on page 26081 in the issue of Tuesday, May 8, 2007, make the following corrections:

1. On page 26081, in the second column, under the heading **SUMMARY**, in the eighth line, ''Fort bliss'' should read ''Fort Bliss''.

2. On the same page, in the third column, under the heading **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, in the second paragraph, in the fifth line, ''infrastructure, airspace'' should read ''infrastructure, training area infrastructure, airspace''.

3. On the same page, in the same column, in the sixth line from the bottom of the page, ''bliss'' should read ''Bliss''.

4. On page 26082, in the first column, in the first full paragraph, in the eighth line, ''551 Redd Branch Road'' should read ''551 Redd Road''.

[FR Doc. C7–2263 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Part 484

[CMS–1541–P]

RIN 0938–AO32

Medicare Program; Home Health Prospective Payment System Refinement and Rate Update for Calendar Year 2008

Correction

In proposed rule document 07–2167 beginning on page 25356 in the issue of Friday, May 4, 2007, make the following correction:

On page 25356, in the first column, under the heading **DATES**, in the last line, ''July 3, 2007'' should read ''June 26, 2007''.

[FR Doc. C7–2167 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D



Federal Register

Friday,

May 11, 2007

Part II

Department of Health and Human Services

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Parts 412 and 413

Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Long-Term Care Hospitals RY 2008: Annual Payment Rate Updates, and Policy Changes; and Hospital Direct and Indirect Graduate Medical Education Policy Changes; Final Rule

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Part 412 and 413

[CMS–1529–F]

RIN 0938–AO30

Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Long-Term Care Hospitals RY 2008: Annual Payment Rate Updates, and Policy Changes; and Hospital Direct and Indirect Graduate Medical Education Policy Changes

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

ACTION: Final Rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule updates the annual payment rates for the Medicare prospective payment system (PPS) for inpatient hospital services provided by long-term care hospitals (LTCHs). The final payment amounts and factors used to determine the updated Federal rates that are described in this final rule were determined based on the LTCH PPS rate year July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. The annual update of the long-term care diagnosis-related group (LTC–DRG) classifications and relative weights remains linked to the annual adjustments of the acute care hospital inpatient diagnosis-related group system, and continue to be effective each October 1. The final outlier threshold for July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, is derived from the LTCH PPS rate year calculations. We are also finalizing policy changes which include revisions to the GME and IME policies. In addition, we are adding a technical amendment correcting the regulations text at § 412.22.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These regulations are effective on July 1, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Tzvi Hefter, (410) 786–4487 (General information).
Judy Richter, (410) 786–2590 (General information, payment adjustments for special cases, and onsite discharges and readmissions, interrupted stays, co-located providers, and short-stay outliers).
Michele Hudson, (410) 786–5490 (Calculation of the payment rates, LTC–DRGs, relative weights and case-mix index, market basket, wage index, budget neutrality, and other payment adjustments).
Ann Fagan, (410) 786–5662 (Patient classification system).
Miechal Lefkowitz, (410) 786–5316 (Graduate Medical Education payments).
Linda McKenna, (410) 786–4537 (Payment adjustments, interrupted stay, and transition period).
Renate Rockwell, (410) 786–4645 (Graduate Medical Education payments).
Elizabeth Truong, (410) 786–6005 (Federal rate update, budget neutrality, other adjustments, and calculation of the payment rates).
Michael Treitel, (410) 786–4552 (High cost outliers and cost-to-charge ratios).

Table of Contents

I. Background
A. Legislative and Regulatory Authority
B. Criteria for Classification as a LTCH
1. Classification as a LTCH
2. Hospitals Excluded from the LTCH PPS
C. Transition Period for Implementation of the LTCH PPS
D. Limitation on Charges to Beneficiaries
E. Administrative Simplification Compliance Act (ASCA) and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Compliance
II. Summary of the Provisions of the Final Rule
A. Summary of Major Contents of this Final Rule
B. Responses to Comments
III. Long-Term Care Diagnosis-Related Group (LTC–DRG) Classifications and Relative Weights
A. Background
B. Patient Classifications into DRGs
C. Organization of DRGs
D. Update of LTC–DRGs
1. Background
2. Method for Updating the LTC–DRG Relative Weights
3. Budget Neutrality (BN) Requirement for the Annual LTC–DRG Update
E. ICD–9–CM Coding System
1. Uniform Hospital Discharge Data Set (UHDDS) Definitions
2. Maintenance of the ICD–9–CM Coding System
3. Coding Rules and Use of ICD–9–CM Codes in LTCHs
IV. Changes to the LTCH PPS Payment Rates for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
A. Overview of the Development of the Payment Rates
B. LTCH PPS Market Basket
1. Overview of the RPL Market Basket
2. Market Basket Estimate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
C. Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
1. Background
2. Update to the Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
3. Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
D. Calculation of LTCH Prospective Payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
1. Adjustment for Area Wage Levels
a. Background
b. Geographic Classifications/Labor Market Area Definitions
c. Labor-Related Share
d. Wage Index Data
2. Adjustment for Cost-of-Living in Alaska and Hawaii
3. Adjustment for High-Cost Outliers (HCOs)
a. Background
b. Cost-to-charge ratios (CCRs)
c. Establishment of the Fixed-Loss Amount
d. Reconciliation of Outlier Payments Upon Cost Report Settlement
e. Application of Outlier Policy to Short-Stay Outlier (SSO) Cases
4. Other Payment Adjustments
5. Budget Neutrality (BN) Offset to Account for the Transition Methodology
6. One-time Prospective Adjustment to the Standard Federal Rate
V. Other Policy Changes for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
A. Short-Stay Outlier (SSO) Cases
1. Background
2. Additional Discussion of the SSO Payment Formula (Includes Technical Correction)
3. Determination of Cost-to-Charge Ratios (CCRs)
4. Reconciliation of SSO Cases
B. Expansion of Special Payment Provisions for LTCH Hospitals within Hospitals (HwHs) and LTCH Satellites: Expansion of the 25 Percent Rule to Certain Situations Not Currently Covered Under Existing § 412.534
VI. Computing the Adjusted Federal Prospective Payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year
VII. Transition Period
VIII. Payments to New LTCHs
IX. Method of Payment
X. Monitoring
XI. MedPAC Recommendations: The RTI Contract
XII. Graduate Medical Education (GME)
A. GME Background
B. Resident Training in Nonhospital Settings
1. Background
2. Moratorium on Disallowances of Allopathic or Osteopathic Family Practice Residents Training Time in Nonhospital Settings, and Questions and Answers (Qs&As) on CMS Web site (Section 713 of the MMA and § 413.78)
3. Requirements for Written Agreements for Residency Training in Nonhospital Settings (§ 413.78(e))
4. Modification of the Definition of ''All or Substantially All of the Costs for the Training Program in the Nonhospital Setting''
5. Implementation of a 90 Percent Cost Threshold
C. Other Issues to be Considered
D. Summary of Final Provisions
XIII. Technical Amendment
XIV. Collection of Information Requirements
XV. Regulatory Impact Analysis
A. Introduction
1. Executive Order 12866
2. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
3. Impact on Rural Hospitals
4. Unfunded Mandates
5. Federalism

6. Alternatives Considered
B. Anticipated Effects of Payment Rate Changes
1. Budgetary Impact
2. Impact on Providers
3. Calculation of Prospective Payments
4. Results
5. Effects on the Medicare Program
C. Impact of Other Policy Changes
1. Effects of Policy Expansion of the Special Payment Provisions for LTCH HwHs and LTCH Satellites to Certain Situations Not Presently Covered by Existing § 412.534 for Subclause (I) LTCHs
2. Effects of Policy Change Relating to Payment for Direct Graduate Medical Education (GME)
D. Accounting Statement
Addendum: Tables

Acronyms

Because of the many terms to which we refer by acronym in this final rule, we are listing the acronyms used and their corresponding terms in alphabetical order below:

AAMC Association of American Medical Colleges
AFMAA Academic Family Medicine Advocacy Alliance
AHA American Hospital Association
AHIMA American Health Information Management Association
ALOS Average length of stay
ALTHA Acute Long Term Hospital Association
AMGA American Medical Group Association
AMPRA American Medical Peer Review Association
AOA American Osteopathic Association
APR All patient refined
ASCA Administrative Simplification Compliance Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–105)
BBA Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Pub. L. 105–33)
BBRA Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP [State Children's Health Insurance Program] Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 (Pub. L. 106–113)
BIPA Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP [State Children's Health Insurance Program] Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–554)
BN Budget neutrality
CBSA Core-based statistical area
CCR Cost-to-charge ratio
C&M Coordination and maintenance
CMI Case-mix index
CMS Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
COLA Cost of living adjustment
CS Consolidated severity-adjusted
CY Calendar year
DSH Disproportionate share of low-income patients
DRGs Diagnosis-related groups
FI Fiscal intermediary
FMC Family Medicine Center
FTE Full-time equivalent
FY Federal fiscal year
GME Graduate medical education
HCO High-cost outlier
HCRIS Hospital cost report information system
HHA Home health agency
HHS (Department of) Health and Human Services
HIPAA Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (Pub. L. 104–191)
HIPC Health Information Policy Council
HwHs Hospitals within hospitals
ICD–9–CM International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (codes)
IME Indirect medical education
I–O Input-Output
IPF Inpatient psychiatric facility
IPPS [Acute Care Hospital] Inpatient Prospective Payment System
IRF Inpatient rehabilitation facility
LOS Length of stay
LTC–DRG Long-term care diagnosis-related group
LTCH Long-term care hospital
MCE Medicare code editor
MDC Major diagnostic categories
MedPAC Medicare Payment Advisory Commission
MedPAR Medicare provider analysis and review
MMA Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108–173)
MSA Metropolitan statistical area
NAICS North American Industrial Classification System
NALTH National Association of Long Term Hospitals
NCHS National Center for Health Statistics
OACT [CMS'] Office of the Actuary
OBRA 86 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–509)
OMB Office of Management and Budget
OPM U.S. Office of Personnel Management
O.R. Operating room
OSCAR Online Survey Certification and Reporting (System)
OTN One-Time Notification
PIP Periodic interim payment
PLI Professional liability insurance
PMSA Primary metropolitan statistical area
PPI Producer Price Indexes
PPS Prospective payment system
PRA Per resident amount
PSF Provider specific file
QIO Quality Improvement Organization (formerly Peer Review organization (PRO))
RIA Regulatory impact analysis
RPL Rehabilitation psychiatric long-term care (hospital)
RTI Research Triangle Institute, International
RY Rate year (begins July 1 and ends June 30)
SIC Standard industrial code
SNF Skilled nursing facility
SSO Short-stay outlier
TEFRA Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (Pub. L. 97–248)
TEP Technical expert panel
UHDDS Uniform hospital discharge data set

I. Background

A. Legislative and Regulatory Authority

Section 123 of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP [State Children's Health Insurance Program] Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 (BBRA) (Pub. L. 106–113) as amended by section 307(b) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000 (BIPA) (Pub. L. 106–554) provides for payment for both the operating and capital-related costs of hospital inpatient stays in long-term care hospitals (LTCHs) under Medicare Part A based on prospectively set rates. The Medicare prospective payment system (PPS) for LTCHs applies to hospitals described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv) of the Social Security Act (the Act), effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002.

Section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act defines a LTCH as ''a hospital which has an average inpatient length of stay (as determined by the Secretary) of greater than 25 days.'' Section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act also provides an alternative definition of LTCHs: Specifically, a hospital that first received payment under section 1886(d) of the Act in 1986 and has an average inpatient length of stay (LOS) (as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (the Secretary)) of greater than 20 days and has 80 percent or more of its annual Medicare inpatient discharges with a principal diagnosis that reflects a finding of neoplastic disease in the 12-month cost reporting period ending in fiscal year (FY) 1997.

Section 123 of the BBRA requires the PPS for LTCHs to be a ''per discharge'' system with a diagnosis-related group (DRG) based patient classification system that reflects the differences in patient resources and costs in LTCHs. It also requires that the ''per discharge'' system maintain budget neutrality (BN). We believe the statutory mandate for BN applies only to the first year of the

implementation of the LTCH PPS such that estimated payments in the first year of the PPS were projected to equal payments that would have been paid for operating and capital-related costs of LTCHs had this new payment system not been enacted.

Section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA, among other things, mandates that the Secretary shall examine, and may provide for, adjustments to payments under the LTCH PPS, including adjustments to DRG weights, area wage adjustments, geographic reclassification, outliers, updates, and a disproportionate share adjustment.

In the August 30, 2002 **Federal Register**, we issued a final rule that implemented the LTCH PPS authorized under BBRA and BIPA (67 FR 55954). This system uses information from LTCH patient records to classify patients into distinct long-term care diagnosis-related groups (LTC–DRGs) based on clinical characteristics and expected resource needs. Payments are calculated for each LTC–DRG and provisions are made for appropriate payment adjustments. Payment rates under the LTCH PPS are updated annually and published in the **Federal Register**.

The LTCH PPS replaced the reasonable cost-based payment system under the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA) (Pub. L. 97–248) for payments for inpatient services provided by a LTCH with a cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2002. (The regulations implementing the TEFRA reasonable cost-based payment provisions are located at 42 CFR part 413.) With the implementation of the PPS for acute care hospitals authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1983 (Pub. L. 98–21), which added section 1886(d) to the Act, certain hospitals, including LTCHs, were excluded from the PPS for acute care hospitals and were paid their reasonable costs for inpatient services subject to a per discharge limitation or target amount under the TEFRA system. For each cost reporting period, a hospital-specific ceiling on payments was determined by multiplying the hospital's updated target amount by the number of total current year Medicare discharges. (Generally, in this document when we refer to discharges, the intent is to describe Medicare discharges.) The August 30, 2002 final rule further details the payment policy under the TEFRA system (67 FR 55954).

In the August 30, 2002 final rule, we also presented an in-depth discussion of the LTCH PPS, including the patient classification system, relative weights, payment rates, additional payments, and the BN requirements mandated by section 123 of the BBRA. The same final rule that established regulations for the LTCH PPS under 42 CFR part 412, subpart O, also contained LTCH provisions related to covered inpatient services, limitation on charges to beneficiaries, medical review requirements, furnishing of inpatient hospital services directly or under arrangement, and reporting and recordkeeping requirements. We refer readers to the August 30, 2002 final rule for a comprehensive discussion of the research and data that supported the establishment of the LTCH PPS (67 FR 55954).

In the June 6, 2003 **Federal Register**, we published a final rule that set forth the FY 2004 annual update of the payment rates for the Medicare PPS for inpatient hospital services furnished by LTCHs (68 FR 34122). It also changed the annual period for which the payment rates are effective. The annual updated rates are now effective from July 1 through June 30 instead of from October 1 through September 30. We refer to the July through June time period as a ''long-term care hospital rate year'' (LTCH PPS rate year). In addition, we changed the publication schedule for the annual update to allow for an effective date of July 1. The payment amounts and factors used to determine the annual update of the LTCH PPS Federal rate is based on a LTCH PPS rate year. While the LTCH payment rate update is effective July 1, the annual update of the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights are linked to the annual adjustments of the acute care hospital inpatient DRGs and are effective each October 1.

In the Prospective Payment System for Long-Term Care Hospitals RY 2007: Annual Payment Rate Updates, Policy Changes, and Clarifications final rule (71 FR 27798) (hereinafter referred to as the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule), we set forth the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year annual update of the payment rates for the Medicare PPS for inpatient hospital services provided by LTCHs. We also adopted the ''Rehabilitation, Psychiatric, Long-Term Care (RPL)'' market basket under the LTCH PPS in place of the excluded hospital with capital market basket. In addition, we implemented a zero percent update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate for RY 2007. We also revised the existing payment adjustment for short stay outlier (SSO) cases by reducing part of the current payment formula and adding a fourth component to that payment formula. In addition, we sunsetted the surgical DRG exception to the payment policy established under the 3-day or less interruption of stay policy. Finally, we clarified the policy at § 412.534(c) for adjusting the LTCH PPS payment so that the LTCH PPS payment is equivalent to what would otherwise be payable under § 412.1(a).

B. Criteria for Classification as a LTCH

1. Classification as a LTCH

Under the existing regulations at § 412.23(e)(1) and (e)(2)(i), which implement section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act, to qualify to be paid under the LTCH PPS, a hospital must have a provider agreement with Medicare and must have an average Medicare inpatient LOS of greater than 25 days. Alternatively, § 412.23(e)(2)(ii) states that for cost reporting periods beginning on or after August 5, 1997, a hospital that was first excluded from the PPS in 1986 and can demonstrate that at least 80 percent of its annual Medicare inpatient discharges in the 12-month cost reporting period ending in FY 1997 have a principal diagnosis that reflects a finding of neoplastic disease must have an average inpatient LOS for all patients, including both Medicare and non-Medicare inpatients, of greater than 20 days.

Section 412.23(e)(3) provides that, subject to the provisions of paragraphs (e)(3)(ii) through (e)(3)(iv) of this section, the average Medicare inpatient LOS, specified under § 412.23(e)(2)(i) is calculated by dividing the total number of covered and noncovered days of stay for Medicare inpatients (less leave or pass days) by the number of total Medicare discharges for the hospital's most recent complete cost reporting period. Section 412.23 also provides that subject to the provisions of paragraphs (e)(3)(ii) through (e)(3)(iv) of this section, the average inpatient LOS specified under § 412.23(e)(2)(ii) is calculated by dividing the total number of days for all patients, including both Medicare and non-Medicare inpatients (less leave or pass days) by the number of total discharges for the hospital's most recent complete cost reporting period.

In the RY 2005 LTCH PPS final rule (69 FR 25674), we specified the procedure for calculating a hospital's inpatient average length of stay (ALOS) for purposes of classification as a LTCH. That is, if a patient's stay includes days of care furnished during two or more separate consecutive cost reporting periods, the total days of a patient's stay would be reported in the cost reporting period during which the patient is discharged (69 FR 25705). Therefore, we revised § 412.23(e)(3)(ii) to specify that,

effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2004, in calculating a hospital's ALOS, if the days of an inpatient stay involve days of care furnished during two or more separate consecutive cost reporting periods, the total number of days of the stay are considered to have occurred in the cost reporting period during which the inpatient was discharged.

Fiscal intermediaries (FIs) verify that LTCHs meet the ALOS requirements. We note that the inpatient days of a patient who is admitted to a LTCH without any remaining Medicare days of coverage, regardless of the fact that the patient is a Medicare beneficiary, will not be included in the above calculation. Because Medicare would not be paying for any of the patient's treatment, data on the patient's stay would not be included in the Medicare claims processing systems. As described in § 409.61, in order for both covered and noncovered days of a LTCH hospitalization to be included, a patient admitted to the LTCH must have at least one remaining benefit day (68 FR 34123).

The FI's determination of whether or not a hospital qualifies as an LTCH is based on the hospital's discharge data from the hospital's most recent complete cost reporting period as specified in § 412.23(e)(3) and is effective at the start of the hospital's next cost reporting period as specified in § 412.22(d). However, if the hospital does not meet the ALOS requirement as specified in § 412.23(e)(2)(i) and (ii), the hospital may provide the FI with data indicating a change in the ALOS by the same method for the period of at least 5 months of the immediately preceding 6-month period (69 FR 25676). Our interpretation of § 412.23(e)(3) was to allow hospitals to submit data using a period of at least 5 months of the most recent data from the immediately preceding 6-month period.

As we stated in the FY 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) final rule, published in the August 1, 2003 **Federal Register**, prior to the implementation of the LTCH PPS, we did rely on data from the most recently submitted cost report for purposes of calculating the ALOS (68 FR 45464). The calculation to determine whether an acute care hospital qualifies for LTCH status was based on total days and discharges for LTCH inpatients. However, with the implementation of the LTCH PPS, for the ALOS specified under § 412.23(e)(2)(i), we revised § 412.23(e)(3)(i) to only count total days and discharges for Medicare inpatients (67 FR 55970 through 55974). In addition, the ALOS specified under § 412.23(e)(2)(ii) is calculated by dividing the total number of days for all patients, including both Medicare and non-Medicare inpatients (less leave or pass days) by the number of total discharges for the hospital's most recent complete cost reporting period. As we discussed in the FY 2004 IPPS final rule, we are unable to capture the necessary data from our present cost reporting forms (68 FR 45464). Therefore, we have notified FIs and LTCHs that until the cost reporting forms are revised, for purposes of calculating the ALOS, we will be relying upon census data extracted from Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MedPAR) files that reflect each LTCH's cost reporting period (68 FR 45464). Requirements for hospitals seeking classification as LTCHs that have undergone a change in ownership, as described in § 489.18, are set forth in § 412.23(e)(3)(iv).

2. Hospitals Excluded From the LTCH PPS

The following hospitals are paid under special payment provisions, as described in § 412.22(c) and, therefore, are not subject to the LTCH PPS rules:

- Veterans Administration hospitals.
- Hospitals that are reimbursed under State cost control systems approved under 42 CFR part 403.
- Hospitals that are reimbursed in accordance with demonstration projects authorized under section 402(a) of the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (Pub. L. 90–248) (42 U.S.C. 1395b–1) or section 222(a) of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 (Pub. L. 92–603) (42 U.S.C. 1395b–1 (note)) (Statewide all-payer systems, subject to the rate-of-increase test at section 1814(b) of the Act).
- Nonparticipating hospitals furnishing emergency services to Medicare beneficiaries.

C. Transition Period for Implementation of the LTCH PPS

In the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 55954), we provided for a 5-year transition period. During this 5-year transition period, a LTCH's total payment under the PPS was based on an increasing percentage of the Federal rate with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of the LTCH PPS payment that is based on reasonable cost concepts. However, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, total LTCH PPS payments are based on 100 percent of the Federal rate.

D. Limitation on Charges to Beneficiaries

In the August 30, 2002 final rule, we presented an in-depth discussion of beneficiary liability under the LTCH PPS (67 FR 55974 through 55975). In the RY 2005 LTCH PPS final rule (69 FR 25676), we clarified that the discussion of beneficiary liability in the August 30, 2002 final rule was not meant to establish rates or payments for, or define Medicare-eligible expenses. Under § 412.507, if the Medicare payment to the LTCH is the full LTC–DRG payment amount, as consistent with other established hospital prospective payment systems, a LTCH may not bill a Medicare beneficiary for more than the deductible and coinsurance amounts as specified under § 409.82, § 409.83, and § 409.87 and for items and services as specified under § 489.30(a). However, under the LTCH PPS, Medicare will only pay for days for which the beneficiary has coverage until the SSO threshold is exceeded. (See section V.A.1.a. of this preamble.) Therefore, if the Medicare payment was for a SSO case (§ 412.529) that was less than the full LTC–DRG payment amount because the beneficiary had insufficient remaining Medicare days, the LTCH could also charge the beneficiary for services delivered on those uncovered days (§ 412.507).

E. Administrative Simplification Compliance Act (ASCA) and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Compliance

Claims submitted to Medicare must comply with both the Administrative Simplification Compliance Act (ASCA) (Pub. L. 107–105), and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) (Pub. L. 104–191). Section 3 of the ASCA requires that the Medicare Program deny payment under Part A or Part B for any expenses incurred for items or services ''for which a claim is submitted other than in an electronic form specified by the Secretary.'' Section 1862(h) of the Act (as added by section 3(a) of the ASCA) provides that the Secretary shall waive such denial in two specific types of cases and may also waive such denial ''in such unusual cases as the Secretary finds appropriate'' (68 FR 48805). Section 3 of the ASCA operates in the context of the ASCA provisions of HIPAA, which include, among other provisions, the transactions and code sets standards requirements codified as 45 CFR parts 160 and 162, subparts A and I through R (generally known as the Transactions Rule). The Transactions Rule requires covered entities, including covered health care

providers, to conduct the covered electronic transactions according to the applicable transactions and code sets standards.

II. Summary of the Provisions of the Final Rule

A. Major Contents of This Final Rule

In this final rule, we are setting forth the annual update to the payment rates for the Medicare LTCH PPS, as well as, other policy changes. The following is a summary of the major areas that we have addressed in this final rule.

In section III. of this preamble, we discuss the LTCH PPS patient classification and the relative weights which remain linked to the annual adjustments of the acute care hospital inpatient DRG system, and are based on the annual revisions to the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD–9–CM) codes effective each October 1.

Also, in section III. of this preamble, we have established a BN requirement for the annual update of the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights to reflect changes in relative LTCH resource use. This requirement ensures that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments will not decrease or increase as a result of the annual update to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights based on the most recent available data. In this section, we also summarize the proposed severity adjusted MS–LTC–DRGs and the development of the proposed relative weights for FY 2008 presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.

As discussed in section IV.C. of this preamble, we are implementing a 0.71 percent update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year based on an adjustment to account for changes in coding practices. Also in section IV. of this preamble, we discuss the prospective payment rate for RY 2008, and in section VI., we discuss the applicable adjustments to the payment rates, including the revisions to the wage index, the labor-related share, the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) factors, and the outlier threshold, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year.

In section V.A. of this preamble, we discuss our change to the current payment formula for certain SSO cases. That is, those cases with a LOS that is less than or equal to one standard deviation of the ALOS of an IPPS discharge that was grouped into the same DRG. However, in situations where the SSO cases would exceed the IPPS discharge that was grouped in the same DRG, payment would continue to be paid under the existing formula.

In section V.B. of this preamble, we discuss the expansion of the present 25 percent admission policy at § 412.534(c) to those certain situations not already affected by the existing policy. Previously, this policy only applied to co-located LTCHs and LTCH satellites whose percentage of discharges exceeded the 25 percent threshold (or the applicable percentage). This is extended to include an adjusted payment to LTCH discharges that were admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH where those discharges exceed the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold. The final policy also applies to grandfathered LTCHs and satellite facilities of LTCHs that have Medicare discharges that were admitted from a hospital co-located with the LTCH or satellite facility of the grandfathered LTCH.

In section X. of this preamble, we will discuss our on-going monitoring protocols under the LTCH PPS.

In section XI. of this preamble, we discuss the recommendations made by the Research Triangle Institute, International's (RTI) evaluation of the feasibility of adopting recommendations made in the June 2004 Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) Report.

In section XII. of this preamble, we discuss our revisions to redefine the statutory term ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting.'' The statute requires that hospitals must pay ''all or substantially all'' of the costs for a training program in a nonhospital setting in order to count FTE residents training in the nonhospital setting for Medicare graduate medical education (GME) payment purposes. We are revising § 413.75(b) to introduce a new definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' to mean, at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities. In addition, we are revising § 412.105(f)(1)(ii)(C) for IME and § 413.78 to reflect this new definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the GME costs in a nonhospital setting, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007.

In section XV. of this preamble, we analyze the impact of the changes presented in this final rule on Medicare expenditures, Medicare-participating LTCHs, and Medicare beneficiaries.

B. Responses to Comments

We received 270 comments on the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule. Comments and responses follow the appropriate policy section in this rule. The following is a comment we received regarding the schedule of the LTCH PPS update.

Comment: One commenter urged CMS to consolidate the July 1 update of the LTCH PPS rates and the October 1 development of the LTC–DRG weights into one publication cycle, a step which the commenter states would be very beneficial for the LTCH industry.

Response: We appreciate the commenter's suggestion and we will evaluate whether such a consolidation is a workable alternative to our present schedule.

III. Long-Term Care Diagnosis-Related Group (LTC–DRG) Classifications and Relative Weights

A. Background

Section 123 of the BBRA requires that the Secretary implement a PPS for LTCHs (that is, a per discharge system with a DRG-based patient classification system reflecting the differences in patient resource use and costs). Section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA modified the requirements of section 123 of the BBRA by requiring that the Secretary examine ''the feasibility and the impact of basing payment under such a system [the LTCH PPS] on the use of existing (or refined) hospital DRGs that have been modified to account for different resource use of LTCH patients, as well as the use of the most recently available hospital discharge data.''

In accordance with section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA and § 412.515, we use information derived from LTCH PPS patient records to classify these cases into distinct LTC–DRGs based on clinical characteristics and estimated resource needs. The LTC–DRGs used as the patient classification component of the LTCH PPS correspond to the hospital inpatient DRGs in the IPPS. (As discussed in greater detail below in this section, in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we have proposed to adopt the severity-weighted patient classification system, the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs, for the LTCH PPS beginning in FY 2008, which is the same patient classification system proposed for use under the IPPS for FY 2008.) We assign an appropriate weight to the LTC–DRGs to account for the difference in resource use by patients exhibiting the case complexity and multiple medical problems characteristic of LTCHs.

In a departure from the IPPS, we use low volume LTC–DRGs (less than 25 LTCH cases) in determining the LTC–DRG weights, since LTCHs do not typically treat the full range of diagnoses as do acute care hospitals. To manage the large number of low volume DRGs (all DRGs with fewer than 25 cases), we group low volume DRGs into 5 quintiles based on average charge per discharge. (A listing of the current composition of low volume quintiles used in determining the FY 2007 LTC–DRG relative weights appears in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47974 through 47978). A listing of the proposed composition of low volume quintiles used in determining the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights appears in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.) We also account for adjustments to payments for cases in which the stay at the LTCH is less than or equal to five-sixths of the geometric ALOS and classify these cases as SSO cases. (A detailed discussion of the application of the Lewin Group model that was used to develop the LTC–DRGs appears in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55978).)

B. Patient Classifications Into DRGs

Generally, under the LTCH PPS, a Medicare payment is made at a predetermined specific rate for each discharge; that payment varies by the LTC–DRG to which a beneficiary's stay is assigned. Consistent with our historical practice of having LTC–DRGs correspond to the DRGs applicable under the IPPS, we will continue to model the LTCH–DRGs after their predecessor CMS DRGs. In addition, we are proposing to use the FY 2008 GROUPER Version 25.0 to be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008.

Cases are classified into LTC–DRGs for payment based on the following six data elements:

(1) Principal diagnosis.
(2) Up to eight additional diagnoses.
(3) Up to six procedures performed.
(4) Age.
(5) Sex.
(6) Discharge status of the patient.

As indicated in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule, upon the discharge of the patient from a LTCH, the LTCH must assign appropriate diagnosis and procedure codes from the most current version of the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD–9–CM). HIPAA Transactions and Code Sets Standards regulations at 45 CFR parts 160 and 162 require that no later than October 16, 2003, all covered entities must comply with the applicable requirements of subparts A and I through R of part 162. Among other requirements, those provisions direct covered entities to use the ASC X12N 837 Health Care Claim: Institutional, Volumes 1 and 2, version 4010, and the applicable standard medical data code sets for the institutional health care claim or equivalent encounter information transaction (see 45 CFR 162.1002 and 45 CFR 162.1102).

Medicare FIs/MACs enter the clinical and demographic information into their claims processing systems and subject this information to a series of automated screening processes called the Medicare Code Editor (MCE). These screens are designed to identify cases that require further review before assignment into a DRG can be made. During this process, the following types of cases, among others, are selected for further development:

- Cases that are improperly coded. (For example, diagnoses are shown that are inappropriate, given the sex of the patient. Code 68.6, Radical abdominal hysterectomy, would be an inappropriate code for a male.)
- Cases including surgical procedures not covered under Medicare. (For example, organ transplant in a non-approved transplant center.)
- Cases requiring more information. (For example, ICD–9–CM codes are required to be entered at their highest level of specificity. There are valid 3-digit, 4-digit, and 5-digit codes. That is, code 262, Other severe protein-calorie malnutrition, contains all appropriate digits, but if it is reported with either fewer or more than 3 digits, the claim will be rejected by the MCE as invalid.)

After screening through the MCE, each claim will be classified into the appropriate LTC–DRG by the Medicare LTCH GROUPER software. As indicated in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule, the Medicare GROUPER software, which is used under the LTCH PPS, is specialized computer software, and is the same GROUPER software program used under the IPPS. The GROUPER software was developed as a means of classifying each case into a DRG on the basis of diagnosis and procedure codes and other demographic information (age, sex, and discharge status). Following the LTC–DRG assignment, the Medicare FI/MAC determines the prospective payment by using the Medicare PRICER program, which accounts for hospital-specific adjustments. Under the LTCH PPS, we provide an opportunity for the LTCH to review the LTC–DRG assignments made by the FI and to submit additional information within a specified timeframe as specified in § 412.513(c).

The GROUPER software is used both to classify past cases to measure relative hospital resource consumption to establish the DRG weights and to classify current cases for purposes of determining payment. The records for all Medicare hospital inpatient discharges are maintained in the MedPAR file. The data in this file are used to evaluate possible DRG classification changes and to recalibrate the DRG weights during our annual update under both the IPPS (§ 412.60(e)) and the LTCH PPS (§ 412.517). As discussed in greater detail in sections III.D. and E. of this preamble, with the implementation of section 503(a) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) (Pub. L. 108–173), there is the possibility that one feature of the GROUPER software program may be updated twice during a Federal FY (October 1 and April 1) as required by the statute for the IPPS (69 FR 48954 through 48957). Specifically, as we discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, diagnosis and procedure codes for new medical technology may be created and added to existing CMS DRGs in the middle of the Federal FY on April 1 (71 FR 47959 and 47971). However, this policy change will have no effect on the LTC–DRG relative weights during the FY, which will continue to be updated only once a year on October 1, nor will there be any impact on Medicare payments under the LTCH PPS during the FY as a result of this policy. The use of the ICD–9–CM code set is also compliant with the current requirements of the Transactions and Code Sets Standards regulations at 45 CFR parts 160 and 162, published in accordance with HIPAA.

In the IPPS proposed rule, we proposed to create and implement MS–DRGs for FY 2008; that is, the proposed MS–DRGs would be effective beginning with discharges on or after October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008. The proposed MS–DRGs are a severity-based system of DRGs in which all existing CMS DRGs were refined to better recognize severity of illness among patients. The details of this proposal can be reviewed online at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/downloads/CMS-1533-P.pdf.*

Under the broad authority of section 123(a) of the BBRA as modified by section 307(b) of the BIPA, we intend to model the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs on the corresponding CMS DRGs as described in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule if this DRG system is implemented for the IPPS in FY 2008. In addition, as

stated above in this section, we intend to use the FY 2008 GROUPER Version 25.0, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008 for the LTCH PPS if the IPPS system is implemented for FY 2008.

To elaborate, if the proposed MS–DRGs are adopted for use by the IPPS, the LTC–DRGs will use the same structure as the proposed MS–DRGs, and will be referred to as the MS–LTC–DRGs. Cases will continue to be classified into MS–LTC–DRGs using the six data elements listed above, and will be subject to review by the MCE as they have in the past. After screening through the MCE, claims will be classified into the appropriate MS–LTC–DRG by the LTCH PPS GROUPER software. Following the MS–LTC–DRG assignment, the Medicare FI/MAC determines the appropriate payment using the Medicare PRICER program.

C. Organization of DRGs

The DRGs are organized into 25 major diagnostic categories (MDCs), most of which are based on a particular organ system of the body; the remainder involve multiple organ systems (such as MDC 22, Burns). Accordingly, the principal diagnosis determines MDC assignment. Within most MDCs, cases are then divided into surgical DRGs and medical DRGs. Surgical DRGs are assigned based on a surgical hierarchy that orders operating room (O.R.) procedures or groups of O.R. procedures by resource intensity. The GROUPER software program does not recognize all ICD–9–CM procedure codes as procedures that affect DRG assignment, that is, procedures which are not surgical (for example, EKG), or minor surgical procedures (for example, 86.11, Biopsy of skin and subcutaneous tissue).

The medical DRGs are generally differentiated on the basis of diagnosis. Both medical and surgical DRGs may be further differentiated based on age, sex, discharge status, and presence or absence of complications or comorbidities (CC). The proposed MS–DRGs, as defined in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, and the MS–LTC–DRGs contain base DRGs that have been subdivided into one, two, or three severity levels. The most severe level has at least one code that is a major CC, referred to as ''with MCC''. The next lower severity level contains cases with at least one CC, referred to as ''with CC''. Those DRGs without an MCC or a CC are referred to as ''without CC/MCC''. When data did not support the creation of three severity levels, the base DRG was divided into either two levels or the base was not subdivided. The proposed two-level subdivisions consist of one of the following subdivisions:

- With CC/MCC.
- Without CC/MCC.

In this type of subdivision, cases with at least one code that is on the CC or MCC list are assigned to the ''with CC/MCC'' DRG. Cases without a CC or an MCC are assigned to the ''without CC/MCC'' DRG.

The other type of proposed two-level subdivision is as follows:

- With MCC.
- Without MCC.

In this type of subdivision, cases with at least one code that is on the MCC list are assigned to the ''with MCC'' DRG. Cases that do not have an MCC are assigned to the ''without MCC'' DRG. This type of subdivision could include cases with a CC code, but no MCC.

We note that CCs are defined by certain secondary diagnoses not related to, or not inherently a part of, the disease process identified by the principal diagnosis. (For example, the GROUPER software would not recognize a code from the 800.0x series, Skull fracture, as a CC when combined with principal diagnosis 850.4, Concussion with prolonged loss of consciousness, without return to preexisting conscious level.) In addition, we note that the presence of additional diagnoses does not automatically generate a CC, as not all MS–DRGs or MS–LTC–DRGs recognize comorbid or complicating conditions in their definition. (For example, proposed MS–DRG 069, Transient Ischemia (formerly CMS DRG 524, Transient Ischemia), is based solely on the principal diagnosis, without consideration of additional diagnoses for DRG determination.)

As discussed in greater detail in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47898 through 47912 and 47973), in its March 2005 Report to Congress, ''Physician-Owned Specialty Hospitals,'' MedPAC recommended that the Secretary improve payment accuracy in the hospital IPPS by, among other things, ''refining the current DRGs to more fully capture differences in severity of illness among patients.'' (Recommendation 1, p. 93.) As we discussed in that same final rule (71 FR 47973), we did not adopt a new severity-adjusted patient classification system under the IPPS, for FY 2007, but we did refine the CMS DRG patient classification system for Version 24.0 of the GROUPER software to improve the CMS DRG system's recognition of severity of illness for FY 2007. The updates to the CMS DRG patient classification system used under the IPPS for FY 2007 (GROUPER Version 24.0), were also applied to the LTC–DRGs used under the LTCH PPS for FY 2007.

In the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we presented the changes to the proposed MS–DRG patient classification system for FY 2008. In that rule, we proposed the IPPS GROUPER Version 25.0 for FY 2008 to process LTCH PPS claims for LTCH discharges occurring from October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008. As noted above in this section and as we also discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, in its March 1, 2005 Report to Congress on Medicare Payment Policy (page 64) and in Recommendation 1 of the 2005 Report to Congress on Physician-Owned Specialty Hospitals, MedPAC recommended that CMS, among other things, refine the current DRGs under the IPPS to more fully capture differences in severity of illness among patients.

D. Update of LTC–DRGs

1. Background

We propose to modify the existing LTC–DRGs so that they reflect the changes made to the CMS DRGs under the proposed IPPS notice. As discussed in greater detail in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, under the LTCH PPS, relative weights for each proposed MS–LTC–DRG are a primary element used to account for the variations in cost per discharge and resource utilization among the payment groups (that is, proposed MS–LTC–DRGs). To ensure that Medicare patients classified to each proposed MS–LTC–DRG have access to an appropriate level of services and to encourage efficiency, each year based on the best available data, we calculate a relative weight for each proposed MS–LTC–DRG that represents the resources needed by an average inpatient LTCH case in that proposed MS–LTC–DRG. For example, cases in a proposed MS–LTC–DRG with a relative weight of 2 will, on average, cost twice as much as cases in a proposed MS–LTC–DRG with a relative weight of 1. Under § 412.517, the proposed MS–LTC–DRG classifications and weighting factors (that is, relative weights) are adjusted annually to reflect changes in factors affecting the relative use of LTCH resources, including treatment patterns, technology and number of discharges.

For FY 2008, the proposed MS–LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights were updated based on LTCH data from the FY 2005 MedPAR file, which contained hospital bills data from the December 2006 update. The proposed MS–LTC–DRG patient classification system is based upon 745 MS–DRGs that formed the structure of the FY 2008

LTCH PPS GROUPER program. The FY 2008 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs continues to include two ''error DRGs.'' As in the IPPS, we included two error DRGs in which cases that cannot be assigned to valid DRGs will be grouped. These two proposed error MS–LTC–DRGs are MS–LTC–DRG 999 (Principal Diagnosis Invalid as a Discharge Diagnosis) and MS–LTC–DRG 998 (Ungroupable). The other 743 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs are the same MS–DRGs used in the IPPS GROUPER program for FY 2008 (Version 25.0).

For FY 2008, as discussed in greater detail in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we proposed to adopt the MS–LTC–DRGs for the LTCH PPS for RY 2008. (Additional information on the proposed MS–LTC–DRG classifications and proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights can be found in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.)

In the past, the annual update to the CMS DRGs was based on the annual revisions to the ICD–9–CM codes and was effective each October 1. The ICD–9–CM coding update process was revised as discussed in greater detail in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48953 through 48957). Specifically, section 503(a) of the MMA includes a requirement for updating diagnosis and procedure codes twice a year instead of the current process of annual updates on October 1 of each year. This requirement is included as part of the amendments to the Act relating to recognition of new medical technology under the IPPS. (For additional information on this provision, including its implementation and its impact on the LTCH PPS, refer to the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48953 through 48957), the RY 2006 LTCH PPS final rule (70 FR 24172 through 24177), and the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4783 through 4784).)

As discussed in the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4784), in implementing section 503(a) of the MMA, there will only be an April 1 update if diagnosis and procedure codes are requested and approved. We note that any new codes created for April 1 implementation will be limited to those diagnosis and procedure code revisions primarily needed to describe new technologies and medical services. However, we reiterate that the process of discussing updates to the ICD–9–CM has been an open process through the ICD–9–CM Coordination and Maintenance (C&M) Committee since 1995. Requestors will be given the opportunity to present the merits for a new code and make a clear and convincing case for the need to update ICD–9–CM codes through an April 1 update.

At the September 2006 ICD–9–CM C&M Committee meeting, there were no requests for an April 1, 2007 implementation of ICD–9–CM codes, and therefore, the next update to the ICD–9–CM coding system will not occur until October 1, 2007 (FY 2008). Presently, as there were no coding changes suggested for an April 1, 2007 update, the ICD–9–CM coding set implemented on October 1, 2006, will continue through September 30, 2007 (FY 2007). As discussed above in this section, the next update to the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs and relative weights for proposed FY 2008 will be presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule. Furthermore, we will notify LTCHs of any revisions to the GROUPER software used under the IPPS and LTCH PPS that would be implemented April 1, 2008. As noted previously in this section, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47973), we established the use of Version 24.0 of the CMS GROUPER, which is used under the IPPS for FY 2007, to classify cases for LTCH PPS discharges that would occur on or after October 1, 2006 and on or before September 30, 2007.

2. Method for Updating the LTC–DRG Relative Weights

As discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule that implemented the LTCH PPS, under the LTCH PPS, each LTCH will receive a payment that represents an appropriate amount for the efficient delivery of care to Medicare patients (67 FR 55984). The system must be able to account adequately for each LTCH's case-mix to ensure both a fair distribution of Medicare payments and access to care for those Medicare patients whose care is more costly. Therefore, in § 412.523(c), we adjust the standard Federal PPS rate by the LTC–DRG relative weights in determining payment to LTCHs for each case. As we have noted above, we are proposing to adopt the MS–LTC–DRGs for the LTCH PPS for FY 2008. However, as discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, this proposed change in the patient classification system does not affect the basic principles of the development of relative weights under a DRG-based PPS. For purposes of clarity, in the general discussion below in which we describe the basic methodology of the patient classification system in use since the start of the LTCH PPS, we use the acronym ''MS–LTC–DRG'' to specify the proposed DRG patient classification system to be used by the LTCH PPS in FY 2008. Although the proposed adoption of the MS–LTC–DRGs would result in some modifications of existing procedures for assigning weights (for example, in cases of zero volume and/or nonmonotonicity, as discussed below), the basic methodology for developing the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule continued to be determined in accordance with the general methodology established in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55989 through 55991), which is discussed below. Therefore, in the discussion below, the term ''LTC–DRGs'' will be used in descriptions of the basic methodology established at the beginning of the LTCH PPS that will remain unchanged if we adopt the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs. The use of the term ''MS–LTC–DRGs'' in the following discussion will indicate a discussion of specifics aspects of our proposed adoption of the severity-weighted patient classification system for FY 2008 as presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.)

Under the LTCH PPS, relative weights for each LTC–DRG are a primary element used to account for the variations in cost per discharge and resource utilization among the payment groups as described in § 412.515. To ensure that Medicare patients who are classified to each LTC–DRG have access to services and to encourage efficiency, we calculate a relative weight for each LTC–DRG that represents the resources needed by an average inpatient LTCH case in that LTC–DRG. For example, cases in a LTC–DRG with a relative weight of 2 will, on average, cost twice as much as cases in a LTC–DRG with a weight of 1.

As we discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, the LTC–DRG relative weights effective under the LTCH PPS for FY 2007 were calculated using the March 2006 update of FY 2005 MedPAR data and Version 24.0 of the GROUPER software (71 FR 47973). We use total days and total charges in the calculation of the LTC–DRG relative weights.

LTCHs often specialize in certain areas, such as ventilator-dependent patients and rehabilitation or wound care. Some case types (DRGs) may be treated, to a large extent, in hospitals that have (from a perspective of charges) relatively high (or low) charges. Distribution of cases with relatively high (or low) charges in specific LTC–DRGs has the potential to inappropriately distort the measure of average charges. To account for the fact that cases may not be randomly distributed across LTCHs, we use a hospital-specific relative value method to calculate relative weights. We believe this method removes this hospital-specific source of bias in measuring

average charges. Specifically, we reduce the impact of the variation in charges across providers on any particular LTC–DRG relative weight by converting each LTCH's charge for a case to a relative value based on that LTCH's average charge. (See the FY 2007 IPPS final rule for further information on the application of the hospital-specific relative value methodology under the LTCH PPS (71 FR 47974 through 47975).)

To account for LTC–DRGs with low volume (that is, with fewer than 25 LTCH cases), we grouped those low volume LTC–DRGs into 1 of 5 categories (quintiles) based on average charges, for the purposes of determining relative weights. For FY 2007 based on the FY 2005 MedPAR data, we identified 180 LTC–DRGs that contained between 1 and 24 cases. This list of low volume LTC–DRGs was then divided into 1 of the 5 low volume quintiles, each containing 36 LTC–DRGs (180/5 = 36). Each of the low volume LTC–DRGs grouped to a specific quintile received the same relative weight and ALOS using the formula applied to the regular LTC–DRGs (25 or more cases). (See the FY 2007 IPPS final rule for further explanation of the development and composition of each of the 5 low volume quintiles for FY 2007 and their composition (71 FR 47975 through 47978).)

After grouping the cases in the appropriate LTC–DRG, we calculated the relative weights by first removing statistical outliers and cases with a LOS of 7 days or less. Next, we adjusted the number of cases remaining in each LTC–DRG for the effect of SSO cases under § 412.529. The short-stay adjusted discharges and corresponding charges were used to calculate ''relative adjusted weights'' in each LTC–DRG using the hospital-specific relative value method. We also adjusted the LTC–DRG relative weights to account for nonmonotonically increasing relative weights. That is, we made an adjustment if cases classified to the LTC–DRG ''with CCs'' of a ''with CC''/''without CC'' pair had a lower average charge than the corresponding LTC–DRG ''without CCs'' by assigning the same weight to both LTC–DRGs in the ''with CC''/''without CC'' pair. (See the FY 2007 IPPS final rule for further details on the steps for calculating the LTC–DRG relative weights (71 FR 47978 through 47984).)

In addition, of the 538 LTC–DRGs in the LTCH PPS for FY 2007, based on LTCH cases in the FY 2005 MedPAR files, we identified 183 LTC–DRGs for which there were no LTCH cases in the database. That is, no patients who would have been classified to those DRGs were treated in LTCHs during FY 2005, and therefore, no charge data were reported for those DRGs. Thus, in the process of determining the relative weights of LTC–DRGs, we were unable to determine weights for these 183 LTC–DRGs using the method described in this section of the preamble. However, since patients with a number of the diagnoses under these LTC–DRGs may be treated at LTCHs beginning in FY 2007, we assigned relative weights to each of the 183 ''no volume'' LTC–DRGs based on clinical similarity and relative costliness to one of the remaining 355 (538–183 = 355) LTC–DRGs for which we were able to determine relative weights, based on the FY 2005 claims data. (A list of the current no-volume LTC–DRGs and further explanation of their FY 2007 relative weight assignment can be found in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47980 through 47984).)

Furthermore, for FY 2007, we established LTC–DRG relative weights of 0.0000 for heart, kidney, liver/intestinal, lung, simultaneous pancreas/kidney, and pancreas transplants (LTC–DRGs 103, 302, 480, 495, 512 and 513, respectively) because presently no LTCH meets the applicable requirements to perform Medicare covered transplant procedures. However, if in the future, a LTCH seeks to meet such requirements as a Medicare-approved transplant center to perform Medicare-covered transplant procedures, we believe that the application and approval procedure would allow sufficient time for us to propose appropriate weights for the LTC–DRGs affected. At the present time, we included these 6 transplant LTC–DRGs in the GROUPER software program for administrative purposes. As the LTCH PPS uses the same GROUPER software program for LTCHs as is used under the IPPS, removing these DRGs would be administratively burdensome.

As we noted previously in this section, there were no new ICD–9–CM code requests for an April 1, 2007 update. Therefore, Version 24.0 of the DRG GROUPER software established in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule will continue to be effective until October 1, 2007. Moreover, the LTC–DRGs and relative weights for FY 2007 established in Table 11 of that same IPPS final rule (71 FR 48321 through 48331) will continue to be effective until October 1, 2007, (just as they would have been even if there had been any new ICD–9–CM code requests for an April 1, 2007 update). Accordingly, Table 3 in the Addendum to this final rule lists the LTC–DRGs and their respective relative weights, geometric ALOS, and five-sixths of the geometric ALOS that we will continue to use for the period of July 1, 2007 through September 30, 2007. (This table is the same as Table 11 of the Addendum to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule.) The next update to the ICD–9–CM coding system will be presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule (since there will be no April 1, 2007 updates to the ICD–9–CM coding system).

In addition, the proposed DRGs and GROUPER for FY 2008 that would be effective October 1, 2007, will be presented in the IPPS FY 2008 proposed rule. Below we provide a summary of the development of the proposed LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008 presented in that same proposed rule. To calculate the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008 in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we obtained total Medicare allowable charges from FY 2006 Medicare LTCH bill data from the December 2006 update of the MedPAR file, which are the best available data at this time, and we used the proposed Version 25.0 of the CMS GROUPER used under the IPPS (as discussed in section II.B. of the preamble of that proposed rule) to classify cases. To calculate the final MS–LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008, we proposed that, if more recent data are available (for example, data from the March 2007 update of the MedPAR file), we would use those data and the finalized Version 25.0 of the CMS GROUPER used under the IPPS. We continued to use total days and total charges in the calculation of the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights. We also continued to use the hospital-specific relative value methodology, described above, for determining the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008.

As noted above in this section, although the proposed adoption of the MS–LTC–DRGs would result in some modifications of existing procedures discussed above for assigning relative weights under the current system (as discussed in detail below), the basic methodology for developing the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule continue to be determined in accordance with the general methodology established in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55989 through 55991) summarized above. With the implementation of the LTCH PPS for FY 2003, we established a procedure to address setting relative weights for LTC–DRG ''pairs'' that were differentiated on the presence or

absence of CCs (71 FR 47979). As discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, our proposal to adopt a severity-based patient classification system for the LTCH PPS, the MS–LTC–DRGs described above, required us to adapt our existing approach for setting relative weights for the severity levels within a specific base DRG. We are also proposed to modify our existing methodology for maintaining monotonicity when setting relative weights for the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs.

As under the existing procedure, under the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs, for purposes of the annual setting of the relative weights, there continue to be three different categories of DRGs based on volume of cases within specific LTC–DRGs. LTC–DRGs with at least 25 cases are each assigned a relative weight; low-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs (that is, proposed MS–LTC–DRGs that contain between 1 and 24 cases annually) are grouped into quintiles (described below) and assigned the weight of the quintile. Cases with no-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs (that is, no cases in the database were assigned to those proposed MS–LTC–DRGs) are cross-walked to other proposed MS–LTC–DRGs based on the clinical similarities and assigned the weight of the quintile that is closest to the relative weight of the cross-walked proposed MS–LTC–DRG. (For in-depth discussions of our proposals regarding proposed relative weight setting for low-volume MS–LTC–DRGs and for no-volume MS–LTC–DRGs, see the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.)

As noted above, for FY 2008, we are proposing to adopt the MS–DRGs for use in both the LTCH PPS and the IPPS. While the LTCH PPS and the IPPS use the same patient classification system, the methodology that is used to set the DRG weights for use in each payment system differs because the overall volume of cases in the LTCH PPS is much less than in the IPPS. As a general rule, as described in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we are proposing to set the weights for the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs using the following steps: (1) If an MS–LTC–DRG has at least 25 cases, it is assigned its own relative weight; (2) if an MS–LTC–DRGs has between 1 and 24 cases, it is assigned to a quintile to which we will assign a relative weight; and (3) if an MS–LTC–DRG has no cases, it is cross-walked to another DRG based upon clinical similarities and assigned the appropriate relative weight. Theoretically, as with the existing LTC–DRG system, cases under the proposed MS–LTC–DRG system that are more severe require greater expenditure of medical care resources and will result in higher average charges. Therefore, in the three severity levels of the base MS–LTC–DRG, relative weights should increase with severity, from lowest to highest. If the relative weights do not increase (that is, if based on the relative weight calculation using the most recent LTCH claims data, a proposed MS–LTC–DRG with MCC would have a lower relative weight than one with CC, or the DRG without CC/MCC would have a higher relative weight than either of the others), there is a problem with monotonicity.

As discussed above in this section, to account for LTC–DRGs with low volume (that is, with fewer than 25 LTCH cases), we group those ''low-volume LTC–DRGs'' (that is, DRGs that contained between 1 and 24 cases annually) into one of five categories (quintiles) based on average charges, for the purposes of determining relative weights. As discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we proposed to continue to employ this treatment of low-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs with a modification to combine proposed MS–LTC–DRGs for the purpose of computing a relative weight in cases where necessary to maintain monotonicity in determining the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights using the best available LTCH data. In that proposed rule, using LTCH cases from the December 2006 update of the FY 2006 MedPAR file, we identified 307 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs that contained between 1 and 24 cases. This list of proposed MS–LTC–DRGs was then divided into one of the 5 low-volume quintiles, each containing a minimum of 61 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs (307/5 = 61, with a remainder of 2 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs). Consistent with our current methodology, we are proposing to make an assignment to a specific low-volume quintile by sorting the low-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs in ascending order by average charge. (*See* the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule for further explanation of the development and composition of each of the 5 low volume quintiles for FY 2007 and their proposed composition.)

As we noted previously, although the proposed adoption of the MS–LTC–DRGs would result in some modifications of existing procedures for assigning relative weights, the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights presented in Table 11 of the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule are based on the methodology established in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55989 through 55991). In summary, as described in greater detail in that same proposed rule, LTCH cases would be grouped to the appropriate proposed MS–LTC–DRG, while taking into account the low-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs as described above, before the proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights can be determined. After grouping the cases to the appropriate proposed MS–LTC–DRG, we proposed to calculate the proposed relative weights for FY 2008 by first removing statistical outliers and cases with a LOS of 7 days or less and to adjust the number of cases in each proposed MS–LTC–DRG for the effect of SSO cases under § 412.529. The short-stay adjusted discharges and corresponding charges are used to calculate ''relative adjusted weights'' in each proposed MS–LTC–DRG using the HSRV method described above.

Next we proposed to determine relative weights for the no-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs. As discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, of the 745 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs for FY 2008, we identified 124 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs for which there were no LTCH cases in the database. That is, no patients who would have been classified to those proposed MS–LTC–DRGs were treated in LTCHs during FY 2006, and therefore, no charge data were reported for those proposed MS–LTC–DRGs. Thus, in the process of determining the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights, we are unable to determine weights for these 124 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs using the methodology described above. However, because patients with a number of the diagnoses under these proposed MS–LTC–DRGs may be treated at LTCHs beginning in FY 2008, we are proposing to assign relative weights to each of the 124 no-volume proposed MS–LTC–DRGs based on clinical similarity and relative costliness to one of the remaining 621 (745–124 = 621) proposed MS–LTC–DRGs for which we are able to determine proposed relative weights, based on FY 2006 LTCH claims data. In general, we determined proposed relative weights for the 124 proposed MS–LTC–DRGs with no LTCH cases in the FY 2006 MedPAR file used in this proposed rule by cross-walking these proposed MS–LTC–DRGs to other proposed MS–LTC–DRGs and then grouping them to the appropriate proposed low-volume quintile. (A list of the proposed no-volume MS–LTC–DRGs and further explanation of their proposed FY 2008 relative weight assignment can be found in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.) We also adjusted the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights to account for nonmonotonically increasing relative weights, including any no volume

proposed MS–LTC–DRGs, where applicable, as described above.

Furthermore, for FY 2008 we proposed to establish proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights of 0.0000 for the following transplant proposed MS–LTC–DRGs: Heart transplant or implant of heart assist system w MCC (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 1); Heart transplant or implant of heart assist system w/o MCC (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 2); Liver transplant w MCC or intestinal transplant (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 5); Liver transplant w/o MCC (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 6); Lung transplant (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 7); Simultaneous pancreas/kidney transplant (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 8); and Pancreas transplant (proposed MS–LTC–DRG 10). As explained in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, this is because Medicare will only cover these procedures if they are performed at a hospital that has been certified for the specific procedures by Medicare and presently no LTCH has been so certified. If in the future a LTCH applies for certification as a Medicare-approved transplant center, we believe that the application and approval procedure would allow sufficient time for us to determine appropriate weights for the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs affected. At the present time, we would only include these seven proposed transplant MS–LTC–DRGs in the GROUPER program for administrative purposes only. Because we use the same GROUPER program for LTCHs as is used under the IPPS, removing these proposed MS–LTC–DRGs would be administratively burdensome. (*See* the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule for further details on the steps for calculating the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008.)

3. Budget Neutrality (BN) Requirement for the Annual LTC–DRG Update

As noted above in this section, currently under § 412.517, the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights are adjusted annually to reflect changes in factors affecting the relative use of LTCH resources, such as treatment patterns, technology and number of discharges. Currently, there are no statutory or regulatory requirements that the annual update to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights be done in a budget neutral manner. Historically, since the initial implementation of the LTCH PPS in FY 2003, we have updated the LTC–DRG relative weights each year without a BN adjustment based on the most recent available LTCH claims data, which reflect current LTCH patient mix and coding practices, and appropriately reflected more or less resource use than the previous year's LTC–DRG relative weights (71 FR 47991). When we proposed changes to the LTC–DRGs for FY 2007 in the FY 2007 IPPS proposed rule, we estimated that those proposed changes to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights would result in about an estimated 1.4 percent decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments (71 FR 24413). As we discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47991), several commenters, including MedPAC, urged us to establish a BN requirement for the annual reclassification and recalibration of the LTC–DRGs so that, in future years, the LTCH PPS could avoid an estimated decrease in estimated aggregate payments, such as the estimated 1.4 percent decrease that resulted from the proposed update to the LTC–DRGs and relative weights for FY 2007. In response to previous proposed annual updates to the LTC–DRG relative weights, we also received comments recommending that a BN adjustment be applied in determining the LTC–DRG relative weights to mitigate LTCH PPS payment fluctuations. (*See* the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48999 through 49000), and the FY 2006 IPPS final rule (70 FR 47333 through 47334).)

In response to those comments, we explained that we understood the commenters' concern with the estimated decrease in payments under LTCH PPS based upon the changes in the LTC–DRGs and relative weights proposed for FY 2007. However, as we discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, we did not postpone the proposed FY 2007 reclassification and recalibration of the LTC–DRGs, nor did we implement those changes in a budget neutral manner. We noted several reasons for the annual fluctuations in LTC–DRG relative weights that have resulted in both estimated increases and decreases in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments in the 4 years since the implementation of the LTCH PPS in FY 2003. Specifically, we reiterated our belief that several factors have affected the changes to the LTC–DRG relative weights over the past 4 years, including actual improvements in coding so that cases are appropriately assigned to LTC–DRGs. We also explained that historically we recalibrated the LTC–DRG relative weights each year based on the most recent available LTCH claims data, which reflect current LTCH patient mix and coding practices, and appropriately reflects more or less resource use than the previous year's LTC–DRG relative weights. The intended purpose of the annual recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights is to reflect any variation in coding practices and charges from the previous year and to help ensure that the LTC–DRG relative weights in the upcoming fiscal year will result in appropriate and accurate payments to LTCHs for the resources they expend to treat their Medicare patients. (71 FR 47984 through 47989)

We also reminded the commenters that under the IPPS, there is a statutory requirement that the annual DRG reclassification and recalibration changes be made in a manner that assures that the estimated aggregate payments are neither greater than nor less than the estimated aggregate payments that would have been made without the changes, but there is no corresponding statutory requirement under the LTCH PPS. However, we noted that, given the considerable discretion granted to the Secretary under section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b) of the BIPA of 2000 to develop the LTCH PPS, it is possible that, at some point, the Secretary would consider using this broad authority to establish a BN policy for the annual update of the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights. We further stated that if we find that it would be appropriate to propose making the updates to the LTC–DRGs and relative weights in a budget neutral manner, the public would have the opportunity to submit comments on any proposed change during the rulemaking process.

As we discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4784 through 4786), a LTCH's case-mix index (CMI) is defined as its case weighted average LTC–DRG relative weight for all its discharges in a given period. Changes in CMI consist of two components: ''real'' CMI changes and ''apparent'' CMI changes. Real CMI increase is defined as the increase in the average LTC–DRG relative weights resulting from the hospital's treatment of more resource intensive patients. Apparent CMI increase is defined as the increase in CMI due to changes in coding practices. The computed (or observed) CMI increase is defined as real CMI increase (due to an increase in patient severity) plus the increase due to changes in coding practices (including better documentation of the medical record by physicians and more complete coding of the medical record by coders). If LTCH patients have more costly impairments, lower functional status, or increased comorbidities, and thus require more resources in the LTCH, we consider this a real change in case-mix. Conversely, if LTCH patients have the same impairments, functional status, and

comorbidities but are coded differently resulting in higher payment, we consider this an apparent change in case-mix. We believe that changes in payment rates, including the LTC–DRG relative weights, should accurately reflect changes in LTCHs' true cost of treating patients (real CMI increase), and should not be influenced by changes in coding practices (apparent CMI increase).

As stated above in this section, apparent CMI increase results from cases being grouped to a LTC–DRG with a higher weight than it would be without such changes in coding practices. As we discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48343 through 48344), in discussing the impact of the changes to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights established for FY 2007 that were estimated to result in an aggregate decrease in LTCH PPS payments of approximately 1.3 percent, we explained that changes in coding practices (rather than patient severity) primarily resulted in fluctuations in the LTC–DRG relative weights in the past. Specifically, based on an analysis of FY 2005 LTCH claims data, we continued to observe that the average LTC–DRG relative weight decreases due to an increase of relatively lower charge cases being assigned to LTC–DRGs with higher relative weights in the prior year. Contributing to this increase in these relatively lower charge cases being assigned to LTC–DRGs with higher relative weights in the prior year are improvements in coding practices, which are typical when moving from a reasonable cost-based payment system to a PPS. The impact of including cases with relatively lower charges into LTC–DRGs that had a relatively higher relative weight in the previous version of the GROUPER software is a decrease in the average relative weight for those LTC–DRGs in the updated version of the GROUPER software.

We noted in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4785) that this same phenomenon of relatively lower charge cases being assigned to LTC–DRGs with higher relative weights in the prior year was also observed when we analyzed the LTCH claims data from FY 2003 and FY 2004 to update the LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2005 and FY 2006, respectively (see the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48999) and the FY 2006 IPPS final rule (70 FR 47701 through 47702).) However, this phenomenon was more notable based on the FY 2004 LTCH claims data that were used to update the LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2006, where the changes to the LTC–DRG weights established were estimated to result in a decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments of 4.2 percent (as compared to the estimated 1.3 percent decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments based on the FY 2005 LTCH claims data used to determine the FY 2007 LTC–DRG relative weights). Because the estimated decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments due to the update to the LTC–DRG relative weights based on more recent (FY 2005) LTCH claims data was significantly lower (1.3 percent estimated based on the LTC–DRG changes for FY 2007) than it was based on FY 2004 LTCH claims data (4.2 percent estimated based on the LTC–DRG changes for FY 2006), we believe that, as LTCHs have become more familiar with the ICD–9–CM coding principles and guidelines used under a DRG-based system, annual changes in LTCH CMI are approaching the point where the observed CMI increase is primarily due to changes in real CMI (that is, increased patient severity) rather than apparent CMI (that is, changes in coding practices). In other words, because we have observed that, over time as LTCHs have gained more experience with ICD–9–CM coding, estimated changes in LTCH PPS payments due to recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights based on more recent claims data (for example, the FY 2007 LTC–DRG relative weights calculated from FY 2005 LTCH claims data as compared to the FY 2006 LTC–DRG relative weights calculated from FY 2004 LTCH claims data) have diminished over time. That is, we have estimated smaller fluctuations in aggregate LTCH PPS payments as a result of the annual recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights based on more recent LTCH claims data generated after the implementation of the LTCH PPS (for example, the 1.3 percent estimated decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments for FY 2007 based on FY 2004 LTCH claims data as compared to the 4.2 percent estimated decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments for FY 2007 based on FY 2005 LTCH claims data).

For these reasons, as discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4785), we believe that LTCH coding practices have stabilized such that the most recent available LTCH claims data now primarily reflect changes in the resources used by the average LTCH patient in a particular LTC–DRG (and not changes in coding practices). Thus, we believe that the most recent available data (as described below in this section) mainly reflect the true costs of treating LTCH patients, and we believe changes in payment rates, including the LTC–DRGs, should reflect such costs. Furthermore, in that same proposed rule, we explained that a LTCH CMI analysis based on the most recent available LTCH claims data, which is discussed in section IV.C. of this preamble, also supports our belief that observed CMI increase is primarily due to changes in real CMI (that is, increased patient severity) rather than apparent CMI (that is, changes in coding practices). Specifically, this CMI analysis indicates that changes in LTCH coding practices, which resulted in fluctuations in the LTC–DRG relative weights in the past, appear to be stabilizing as LTCHs have become more familiar with a DRG-based system.

Specifically, this LTCH CMI analysis shows that the overall observed change in LTCH CMI from FY 2003 compared to FY 2004 was an increase of approximately 6.75 percent while the overall observed change in LTCH CMI from FY 2004 compared to FY 2005 was an increase of approximately 3.49 percent, which is only about half of the LTCH CMI growth measured from the prior period (that is, the 6.75 percent from FY 2003 to FY 2004). Furthermore, preliminary analysis of FY 2006 LTCH claims data, which reflects over 3 full years of experience under the LTCH PPS for most LTCHs, showed an even smaller overall observed CMI increase of about 1.9 percent from FY 2005 compared to FY 2006. Again, the observed CMI increase from FY 2005 to FY 2006 is only about half of the LTCH CMI growth measured from the prior period (that is, the 3.49 percent from FY 2004 to FY 2005). Because this LTCH CMI analysis shows that observed CMI is declining, we believe that LTCH coding practices have stabilized such that changes in LTCH CMI are now primarily due to changes in real CMI (that is, increased patient severity) rather than apparent CMI (that is, changes in coding practices). In other words, because we believe that the observed annual CMI increase is primarily ''real'' and not ''apparent,'' it is no longer necessary to update the LTC–DRGs in a non-budget neutral manner (as discussed in greater detail below in this section). As stated above in this section, we believe that changes in payment rates, including the LTC–DRG relative weights, should accurately reflect changes in LTCHs' true cost of treating patients (real CMI increase) and should not be influenced by changes in coding practices (apparent CMI increase).

In light of these facts, in order to mitigate estimated fluctuations in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS

payments, as urged by past commenters, we stated in the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4785) that we had given further consideration to the issue of establishing a BN requirement for annual LTC–DRG reclassification and recalibration. Therefore, in that proposed rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary under section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA to develop the LTCH PPS, we proposed that, beginning with the LTC–DRG update for FY 2008, the annual update to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights would be done in a budget neutral manner such that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would be unaffected, that is, would be neither greater than nor less than the estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that would have been made without the LTC–DRG classification and relative weight changes. Accordingly, we proposed to revise § 412.517 to specify that annual changes to the LTC–DRG classifications and the recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights would be made in a budget neutral manner such that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments are not affected.

Comment: Numerous commenters, including MedPAC, supported our proposal to recalibrate the LTC–DRGs annually in a budget neutral manner. Some commenters also recommended that we should monitor the recalibration so that any reweighting of the LTC–DRGs is conducted in a manner that does not result in a redistribution of payments from high acuity DRGs to lower acuity DRGs, pending implementation of revised certification criteria designed to screen out LTCH inappropriate patients.

Response: We appreciate the commenters' support of our proposed BN requirement for the annual LTC–DRG update. As discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4785 through 4786), we explained that we believe that it would be appropriate to update the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights in a budget neutral manner at this time for the reasons discussed below. As noted above in this section, the relative weight for each LTC–DRG represents the resources needed by an average inpatient LTCH case in that LTC–DRG, such that LTCH cases in a LTC–DRG with a relative weight of 2 will, on average, cost twice as much as cases in a LTC–DRG with a relative weight of 1.

In the past when we recalibrated the LTC–DRG relative weights each year without a BN adjustment based on the most recent available LTCH claims data, we believe that the resulting LTC–DRG relative weights appropriately reflected more or less resource use than the previous year's LTC–DRG relative weights, and that the estimated aggregate payment changes were appropriate given that the LTCH claims data used to determine those LTC–DRG relative weights reflected changes in coding practices, as well as changes in actual resource use. Historically, we have not updated the LTC–DRGs in a budget neutral manner because we believed that past fluctuations in the LTC–DRG relative weights were primarily due to changes in LTCH coding practices, which included both ''real'' and ''apparent'' changes in LTCHs' case-mix (as discussed above in this section). We believe that changes in the LTCH PPS payment rates, including the LTC–DRG relative weights, should accurately reflect changes in LTCHs' true cost of treating patients (real CMI increase), and should not be influenced by changes in coding practices (apparent CMI increase). Therefore, in the past we did not update the LTC–DRGs in a budget neutral manner so that ''apparent'' CMI changes were not permanently built into the LTCH PPS payment rates.

Because LTCH 2006 claims data does not appear to significantly reflect changes in LTCH coding practices in response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS (as explained above in this section), we believe that it may be appropriate to update the LTC–DRGs so that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would neither increase or decrease since we believe that changes in the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights should accurately reflect changes in LTCHs' resource use (that is, true cost of treating patients) and should not be influenced by changes in coding practices, and that the most recent such LTCH claims data primarily reflects changes in the resources needed by an average LTCH case in a particular LTC–DRG (and not changes in coding practices).

Thus, we now believe it would be reasonable and appropriate to update the LTC–DRGs in a budget neutral manner, beginning in FY 2008, so that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS would be unaffected (that is, estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would not be greater than or less than they would have been without the proposed LTC–DRG classification and relative weight changes) by any changes resulting from the annual reclassification and recalibration of the LTC–DRGs. Updating the LTC–DRGs in a budget neutral manner would result in an annual update to the individual LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights based on the most recent available data to reflect changes in relative LTCH resource use; however, the LTC–DRG relative weights would be uniformly adjusted to ensure that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS would not be affected (that is, decreased or increased).

In this final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary under section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA to develop the LTCH PPS, beginning with the LTC–DRG update for FY 2008 (discussed in greater detail below), the annual update to the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights will be done in a budget neutral manner such that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments will be unaffected, that is, will be neither greater than nor less than the estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that would have been made without the LTC–DRG classification and relative weight changes. Accordingly, we are revising § 412.517 to specify that annual changes to the LTC–DRG classifications and the recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights are made in a budget neutral manner such that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments are not affected.

As discussed above, we believe that the most recent available LTCH claims data reflects the intensity of resource use of the treatment of Medicare patients based on current LTCH coding and treatment practices. Accordingly, we believe that annually updating the LTC–DRG relative weights using the most recent available LTCH claims data reflects more or less resource use than the previous year's LTC–DRG relative weights based on the current LTCH practices. Therefore, we believe that any redistribution in payments as a result of the annual recalibration of the LTC–DRG relative weights based on this updated LTCH claims data appropriately reflects LTCH resource use in the treatment of their Medicare patients. While we will continue to monitor LTCH data, including any redistribution of payments upon the annual update of the LTC DRGs, for the reasons discussed above, we are not adopting the commenters' suggestion to establish a requirement that the annual recalibration of the relative weights be done in a manner that would adjust for redistribution of payments from high acuity LTC–DRGs to lower acuity LTC–DRGs.

As we explained in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4786), we intend to update the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights for FY 2008 based on the best available data

at the time to allow for changes in factors affecting hospital resource use, including but not limited to, practice patterns and new technology. This will be done in a budget neutral manner, such that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS would neither decrease or increase as a result of the changes due to the annual reclassification and recalibration of the LTC–DRGs. Because we will continue to use the most recent available LTCH data, the updated LTC–DRG relative weights will continue to reflect changes in LTCH resource use (as is the case under the current (non-budget neutral) LTC–DRG update methodology). Thus, for example, if the most recent LTCH claims data showed that the resource use for hypothetical LTC–DRG ''ABC'' is double the resource use for hypothetical LTC–DRG ''XYZ,'' then the value of the relative weight for LTC–DRG ''ABC'' would be about twice the value of relative weight for LTC–DRG ''XYZ.''

In addition to accounting for changes in relative resource use, to include a BN requirement for the annual update to the LTC–DRGs, the updated LTC–DRG relative weights will need to be uniformly adjusted to ensure that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments will not be affected. That is, a BN factor will need to be computed to ensure that the LTC–DRG reclassification and recalibration process, by itself, neither increases nor decreases estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments.

As discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, to accomplish BN when annually updating the LTC–DRG classifications and relative weights under revised § 412.517, we proposed to use a method that is similar to the methodology used under the IPPS. (Information on the IPPS DRG BN adjustment can be found in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47970).) As noted above, we proposed to adopt the MS–LTC–DRGs for the LTCH PPS for FY 2008. Therefore, in the discussion that follows, we will refer to the development of the proposed budget neutrality factor in terms of the proposed MS–LTC–DRG severity-weighted patient classification system. Specifically, after recalibrating the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights, as we do under our existing methodology (as described in detail in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47978 through 47981)), as described in greater detail in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we would calculate and apply a normalization factor (which will be published annually in the IPPS proposed and final rules when we update the LTC–DRGs and relative weights) to the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights to ensure that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments are not influenced by changes in the composition of case types or changes made to the classification system. That is, the normalization adjustment is intended to ensure that the recalibration of the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights (that is, the process itself) neither increases nor decreases total estimated payments. To calculate the normalization factor, we proposed to use the most recent available claims data (FY 2006) and apply the proposed GROUPER (Version 25.0) to calculate the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights. (We also proposed to use the most recent available claims data in the analysis for this final rule.) These weights were determined such that the average CMI value is 1.0. Then, we proposed to group the same claims data (FY 2006) using the current GROUPER (Version 24.0) and current LTC–DRG relative weights. The average CMI was calculated for the claims data using the current GROUPER and relative weights. Finally, the ratio of the average CMI of the claims data set under the current GROUPER and the proposed GROUPER was calculated as the proposed normalization factor.

For FY 2008, based on the latest available data, the proposed normalization factor is estimated as 1.020302, which was applied to each proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weight. (We also stated that if more current data become available prior to publication of the final rule, we will use those data to determine the normalization factor.) That is, each proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weight was multiplied by 1.020302 in the first step of the BN process.

We are also proposed to ensure that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments (based on the most recent available LTCH claims data) after recalibration (the proposed relative weights) would be equal to estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments (for the same most recent available LTCH claims data) before recalibration (the existing relative weights). Therefore, we proposed to calculate the BN adjustment factor by simulating estimated payments under both sets of GROUPERs and relative weights. We proposed to simulate total estimated payments under the current payment policies (RY 2007) using the most recent available claims data (FY 2006) and using the proposed GROUPER (Version 25.0), and normalized relative weights. Then, we proposed to simulate estimated payments using the most recent available claims data (FY 2006) and apply the proposed GROUPER (Version 25.0). We next calculated payments using the same claims data (FY 2006) with the current GROUPER (Version 24.0). The ratio of the estimated average payment under the current GROUPER and the proposed GROUPER was calculated as the proposed BN factor. Then each of the proposed normalized relative weights was multiplied by the proposed BN factor to determine the proposed budget neutral relative weight for each proposed MS–LTC–DRG. Accordingly, based on the most recent available data, we proposed to apply a BN factor of 1.003924 to the relative weights after normalizing. To calculate the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2008, we obtained total Medicare allowable charges from FY 2006 Medicare LTCH bill data from the December 2006 update of the MedPAR file, which are the best available data at that time. We also proposed that if more current data become available prior to publication of the final rule, we will use those data to determine the budget neutrality factor. The proposed FY 2008 MS–LTC–DRG relative weights are presented in Table 11 in the Addendum of the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, which reflect the budget neutral adjustment described above.

In the recently issued FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we proposed significant refinements to the DRGs used under both the IPPS and LTCH PPS to better recognize severity of illness among patients. The proposed refinements would be effective October 1, 2007. The proposed new MS–DRG and MS–LTC–DRG systems present opportunities to acute care hospitals and LTCHs, respectively, to improve documentation and coding to receive higher payments without a real increase in patient severity of illness. The Office of the Actuary estimates an adjustment of −2.4 percent to the IPPS rates for each of FY 2008 and FY 2009 will be necessary to account for the anticipated improvements in coding and documentation. In the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule, we proposed to apply this −2.4 percent adjustment for case mix increase in FY 2008 and in FY 2009 in both the IPPS and LTCH PPS systems to address the proposed change to the refined severity DRGs. It should be noted that this adjustment is not related to the finalized budget neutrality adjustment included in this LTCH final rule and discussed above. The budget neutrality adjustment in this rule is an annual requirement that is needed to assure that annual recalibration of the DRG weights based on the most recent available claims data, results in no

changes (increase or decrease) in estimated payments that stem from updating the DRG weights, while the proposed −2.4 percent adjustment for FYs 2008 and 2009 is tied solely to the proposed change to the MS–LTC–DRGs. Accordingly, each of the proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weights in Table 11 of the Addendum to the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule reflects this proposed adjustment. That is, each proposed MS–LTC–DRG relative weight was multiplied by a factor of 0.976 to account for changes in coding or classification of discharges resulting from the proposed adoption of the new patient classification system. This proposed adjustment is consistent with the proposed adjustment applied to the proposed IPPS rates for FYs 2008 and 2009 to eliminate the effect of changes in coding or classification of discharges that do not reflect real change in case-mix because we believe that adoption of the proposed MS–LTC–DRGs would create a risk of increased aggregate levels of payment as a result of increased documentation and coding.

E. ICD–9–CM Coding System

1. Uniform Hospital Discharge Data Set (UHDDS) Definitions

Because the assignment of a case to a particular LTC-DRG or the proposed MS–LTC–DRG will help determine the amount that will be paid for the case, it is important that the coding is accurate. Classifications and terminology used in the LTCH PPS are consistent with the ICD–9–CM coding scheme and the UHDDS, as recommended to the Secretary by the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics (''Uniform Hospital Discharge Data: Minimum Data Set, National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), April 1980'') and as revised in 1984 by the Health Information Policy Council (HIPC) of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

We note that the ICD–9–CM coding terminology and the definitions of principal and other diagnoses of the UHDDS are consistent with the requirements of the HIPAA Administrative Simplification Act of 1996 (45 CFR part 162). Furthermore, the UHDDS was used as a standard for the development of policies and programs related to hospital discharge statistics by both governmental and nongovernmental sectors for over 30 years. In addition, the following definitions (as described in the 1984 Revision of the UHDDS, approved by the Secretary for use starting January 1986) are requirements of the ICD–9–CM coding system, and have been used as a standard for the development of the CMS–DRGs:

- Diagnoses are defined to include all diagnoses that affect the current hospital stay.
- Principal diagnosis is defined as the condition established after study to be chiefly responsible for occasioning the admission of the patient to the hospital for care.
- Other diagnoses (also called secondary diagnoses or additional diagnoses) are defined as all conditions that coexist at the time of admission, that develop subsequently, or that affect the treatment received or the LOS or both. Diagnoses that relate to an earlier episode of care that have no bearing on the current hospital stay are excluded.
- All procedures performed will be reported. This includes those that are surgical in nature, carry a procedural risk, carry an anesthetic risk, or require specialized training.

We provide LTCHs with a 60-day window after the date of the notice of the initial LTC–DRG or proposed MS–LTC–DRG assignment to request review of that assignment of the discharge to an LTC–DRG or MS–LTC–DRG. Additional information may be provided by the LTCH to the FI as part of that review.

2. Maintenance of the ICD–9–CM Coding System

The ICD–9–CM C&M Committee is a Federal interdepartmental committee, co-chaired by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and CMS, which is charged with maintaining and updating the ICD–9–CM system. The C&M Committee is jointly responsible for approving coding changes, and developing errata, addenda, and other modifications to the ICD–9–CM to reflect newly developed procedures and technologies and newly identified diseases. The C&M Committee is also responsible for promoting the use of Federal and non-Federal educational programs and other communication techniques with a view toward standardizing coding applications and upgrading the quality of the classification system.

The NCHS has lead responsibility for the ICD–9–CM diagnosis codes included in the Tabular List and Alphabetic Index for Diseases, while CMS has the lead responsibility for the ICD–9–CM procedure codes included in the Tabular List and Alphabetic Index for Procedures. The C&M Committee encourages participation by health-related organizations in this process and holds public meetings for discussion of educational issues and proposed coding changes twice a year at the CMS Central Office located in Baltimore, Maryland. The agenda and dates of the meetings can be accessed on our Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/ICD9ProviderDiagnosticCodes.*

As discussed previously in this section, for the IPPS, section 503(a) of the MMA includes a requirement for updating diagnosis and procedure codes twice a year instead of annual updates on October 1 of each year. This requirement will improve the recognition of new technologies under the IPPS by accounting for them in the GROUPER software at an earlier date. Because this statutory requirement could have a significant impact on health care providers, coding staff, publishers, system maintainers, and software systems, among others, we solicited comments on our proposed provisions to implement this requirement as part of the FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule (69 FR 28220 through 28221). We responded to comments and published our new policy regarding the updating of diagnosis and procedure codes (currently the ICD–9–CM) in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48953 through 48957). In addition, we established a policy for the possibility of an April 1 ICD–9–CM diagnosis and procedure code update in the RY 2006 LTCH PPS final rule (70 FR 24176) since LTCH systems would be expected to recognize and report those new codes through the channels described in this section even though no DRG additions or deletions or changes to relative weights will occur prior to the usual October 1 update. (For more detailed information on the affect of the statutory mandates directed at the IPPS as amended by section 503(a) of the MMA, refer to the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48954 through 48957) and the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27806 through 27808)).

Current addendum and code title information is published on the CMS Web site at: *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/ICD9ProviderDiagnosticCodes/04_addendum.asp*. Summary tables showing new, revised, and deleted code titles are also posted on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/ICD9ProviderDiagnosticCodes/07_summarytables.asp*. Information on ICD–9–CM diagnosis codes can be found at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/ICD9ProviderDiagnosticCodes/*. Information on new, revised, and deleted ICD–9–CM codes is also available in the American Hospital Association (AHA) publication, the *Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM.* AHA also distributes information to publishers and software vendors. We also send copies of all ICD–9–CM coding changes to our contractors for use in updating

their systems and providing education to providers. In addition, of particular note to LTCHs are the invalid diagnosis codes (Table 6C) and the invalid procedure codes (Table 6D) located in the annual proposed and final rules for the IPPS. Claims with invalid codes are not processed by the Medicare claims processing system.

3. Coding Rules and Use of ICD–9–CM Codes in LTCHs

We continue to urge LTCHs to focus on improved coding practices. Inappropriate coding of cases can adversely affect the uniformity of cases in each LTC–DRG or proposed MS–LTC–DRG and produce inappropriate weighting factors at the annual recalibration. Because of concerns raised by LTCHs concerning correct coding, we have asked the AHA to provide additional clarification and instruction on proper coding in the LTCH setting. The AHA will provide this instruction via their established process of addressing questions through their publication, the *Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM.* Written questions or requests for clarification may be addressed to the Central Office on ICD–9–CM, American Hospital Association, One North Franklin, Chicago, IL 60606. A form for question(s) is available for download and can be mailed on AHA's Web site at: *www.ahacentraloffice.org.* In addition, current coding guidelines are available at the NCHS Web site: *http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/datawh/ftpserv/ftpicd9/ftpicd9.htm#conv.*

In conjunction with the cooperating parties (AHA, the American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA), and NCHS), we reviewed actual medical records and continue to emphasize the importance of the quality of the documentation under the LTCH PPS. Based on the LTCH claims data analysis described above in section III.D.2. of this preamble, we fully believe that with some experience under a PPS, the quality of the documentation and coding of LTCHs has improved, as it did for the IPPS. However, because of the need for proper coding by LTCHs, the cooperating parties will assist their members with continued improvement in documentation and coding issues for the LTCHs through specific questions and coding guidelines. The importance of consistent and complete documentation is emphasized in the revised ICD–9–CM Official Guidelines for Coding and Reporting: ''A joint effort between the attending physician and coder is essential to achieve complete and accurate documentation, code assignment, and reporting of diagnoses and procedures. The importance of consistent, complete documentation in the medical record cannot be overemphasized. Without this documentation, the application of all coding guidelines is a difficult, if not impossible task'' (*Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM,* Fourth Quarter 2002, page 115).

To improve medical record documentation, LTCHs should be aware that if the patient is being admitted for continuation of treatment of an acute or chronic condition, guidelines at Section I.B.10 of the *Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM*, Fourth Quarter 2002 (page 129) are applicable for the selection of principal diagnosis. To clarify coding advice issued in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55979), at Guideline I.B.12, Late Effects, we state that a late effect is considered to be the residual effect (condition produced) after the acute phase of an illness or injury has terminated (*Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM*, Fourth Quarter 2002, page 129). Regarding whether a LTCH should report the ICD–9–CM code(s) for an unresolved acute condition instead of the code(s) for late effects of rehabilitation, we emphasize that each case must be evaluated on its unique circumstances and coded appropriately. Depending on the documentation in the medical record, either a code reflecting the acute condition or rehabilitation could be appropriate in a LTCH.

Since implementation of the LTCH PPS, our Medicare FIs have conducted training and provided assistance to LTCHs in correct coding. We have also issued manuals containing procedures, as well as coding instructions to LTCHs and FIs. We will continue to conduct training and provide guidance on an ''as needed'' basis. We also refer readers to the detailed discussion on correct coding practices in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55981 through 55983). Additional coding instructions and examples will be published in the *Coding Clinic for ICD–9–CM.*

IV. Changes to the LTCH PPS Payment Rates for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

A. Overview of the Development of the Payment Rates

The LTCH PPS was effective beginning with a LTCH's first cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2002. Effective with that cost reporting period, LTCHs are paid, during a 5-year transition period, a total LTCH prospective payment that is comprised of an increasing proportion of the LTCH PPS Federal rate and a decreasing proportion based on reasonable cost-based principles, unless the hospital makes a one-time election to receive payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, as specified in § 412.533. New LTCHs (as defined at § 412.23(e)(4)) are paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, with no phase-in transition payments.

The basic methodology for determining LTCH PPS Federal prospective payment rates is set forth at § 412.515 through § 412.532. In this section, we discuss the factors that will be used to update the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year that will be effective for LTCH discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. When we implemented the LTCH PPS in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56029 through 56031), we computed the LTCH PPS standard Federal payment rate for FY 2003 by updating the latest available (FY 1998 or FY 1999) Medicare inpatient operating and capital cost data, using the excluded hospital market basket.

Section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA requires that the PPS developed for LTCHs be budget neutral for the initial year of implementation. Therefore, in calculating the standard Federal rate under § 412.523(d)(2), we set total estimated LTCH PPS payments equal to estimated payments that would have been made under the reasonable cost-based payment methodology had the PPS for LTCHs not been implemented. Section 307(a) of the BIPA specified that the increases to the hospital-specific target amounts and the cap on the target amounts for LTCHs for FY 2002 provided for by section 307(a)(1) of the BIPA shall not be considered in the development and implementation of the LTCH PPS.

Furthermore, as specified at § 412.523(d)(1), the standard Federal rate is reduced by an adjustment factor to account for the estimated proportion of outlier payments under the LTCH PPS to total estimated LTCH PPS payments (8 percent). For further details on the development of the FY 2003 standard Federal rate, see the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56027 through 56037), and for subsequent updates to the LTCH PPS Federal rate, refer to the following final rules: RY 2004 LTCH PPS final rule (68 FR 34134 through 34140), RY 2005 LTCH PPS final rule (69 FR 25682 through 25684), RY 2006 LTCH PPS final rule (70 FR 24179 through 24180), and RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27819 through 27827).

B. LTCH PPS Market Basket

1. Overview of the RPL Market Basket

Historically, the Medicare program has used a market basket to account for price increases of the services furnished by providers. The market basket used for the LTCH PPS includes both operating and capital-related costs of LTCHs because the LTCH PPS uses a single payment rate for both operating and capital-related costs. The development of the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate, using the excluded hospital with capital market basket, is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56027 through 56033).

In the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56016 through 56017 and 56030), which implemented the LTCH PPS, we established the use of the excluded hospital with capital market basket as the LTCH PPS market basket. The excluded hospital with capital market basket was also used to update the limits on LTCHs' operating costs for inflation under the TEFRA reasonable cost-based payment system. We explained that we believe the use of the excluded hospital with capital market basket to update LTCHs' costs for inflation was appropriate because the excluded hospital market basket (with a capital component) measures price increases of the services furnished by excluded hospitals, including LTCHs. For further details on the development of the excluded hospital with capital market basket, see the RY 2004 LTCH PPS final rule (68 FR 34134 through 34137).

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27810), we noted that based on our research, we did not develop a market basket specific to LTCH services. We are still unable to create a separate market basket specifically for LTCHs due to the small number of facilities and the limited amount of data that is reported (for instance, only approximately 15 percent of LTCHs reported contract labor cost data for 2002). In that same final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, we adopted the ''Rehabilitation, Psychiatric and Long-Term Care (RPL) market basket'' as the appropriate market basket of goods and services under the LTCH PPS for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2006. Specifically, beginning with the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year, for the LTCH PPS, we adopted the use of the RPL market basket based on FY 2002 cost report data as it was the best available data. We choose to use the FY 2002 Medicare cost reports because these are the most recent, relatively complete cost data for inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs), inpatient psychiatric facilities (IPF), and LTCHs.

The RPL market basket is determined based on the operating and capital costs of IRFs, IPFs and LTCHs. Since all IRFs are now paid under the IRF PPS Federal payment rate, nearly all LTCHs are paid 100 percent of the Federal rate under the LTCH PPS, and most IPFs are transitioning to payment based on 100 percent of the Federal per diem payment amount under the IPF PPS (payments to IPFs will be based exclusively on 100 percent of the Federal rate for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2008), the RPL market basket reflects changes in the operating and capital costs for these hospitals. As we explained in that same final rule, we believe a market basket based on the data of IRFs, IPFs and LTCHs is appropriate to use under the LTCH PPS since it is the best available data that reflects the cost structures of LTCHs.

For further details on the development of the RPL market basket, including the methodology for determining the operating and capital portions of the RPL market basket, see the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27810 through 27817).

2. Market Basket Estimate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

Consistent with our historical practice, we estimate market basket increase based on Global Insight's forecast using the most recent available data. The most recent estimate of the RPL market basket for July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 (the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year), based on Global Insight's 1st quarter 2007 forecast with history through the 4th quarter of 2006, is 3.2 percent. Global Insight, Inc. is a nationally recognized economic and financial forecasting firm that contracts with CMS to forecast changes in the components of the market baskets. Consistent with our historical practice of using market basket estimates based on the most recent available data, we are finalizing 3.2 percent as the estimate of the RPL market basket for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year.

As discussed in greater detail in this section, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we are updating the standard Federal rate by 0.71 percent. The update reflects an adjustment based on the most recent market basket estimate (currently 3.2 percent) and an adjustment to account for the increase in case-mix in the prior period (FY 2005) that resulted from changes in coding practices rather than an increase in patient severity.

C. Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

1. Background

At § 412.523(c)(3)(ii), for LTCH PPS rate years beginning RY 2004 through RY 2006, we updated the standard Federal rate to adjust for the most recent estimate of the projected increases in prices for LTCH inpatient hospital services. We established the policy of annually updating the standard Federal rate by the increase factor described in the RY 2004 LTCH PPS final rule (68 FR 34138) because at that time we believed that was the most appropriate method for updating the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate annually for years after FY 2003. When we moved the date of the annual update of the LTCH PPS from October 1 to July 1 in the RY 2004 LTCH PPS final rule (68 FR 34138), we revised § 412.523(c)(3) to specify that for LTCH PPS rate years beginning on or after July 1, 2003, the annual update to the standard Federal rate for the LTCH PPS would be equal to the previous rate year's Federal rate updated by the most recent estimate of increases in the appropriate market basket of goods and services included in covered inpatient LTCH services. We believed that was the most appropriate method for updating the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate annually for years after RY 2004. In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27818), we established at § 412.523(c)(3)(iii) that the update to the standard Federal rate for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year is zero percent. As discussed in that same final rule, we explained that rather than solely using the most recent estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket as the basis of the update factor for the Federal rate for RY 2007, we believed it was appropriate to adjust the rate to account for the changes in coding practices (rather than patient severity) as indicated by our ongoing monitoring activities.

Accordingly, we established the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate, effective from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 (the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year), at $38,086.04 (71 FR 27818). Additionally, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule (71 FR 4742 through 4747), we provided a description of a preliminary model of an update framework under the LTCH PPS. We received few comments on that update framework preliminary model. As discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27818 through 27819 and 27902 through 27906), although we did not propose to adopt an analytical

update framework, we continued to solicit comments on the framework based on the preliminary model, using the best available data and concepts, and we may propose to adopt a framework at some time in the future. While we did not receive any comments regarding the update framework during the public comment period for the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we continue to be interested in comments and suggestions on the preliminary model of an update framework under the LTCH PPS that was present in Appendix A of the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27902 through 27906).

In the discussion that follows, we explain how we developed the standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Specifically, we explain our rationale, which is based on our ongoing monitoring activities, for implementing an annual update to the standard Federal rate for RY 2008 that reflects an adjustment for the most recent market basket estimate and an adjustment to account for the increase in case-mix in a prior period (FY 2005) that resulted from changes in coding practices rather than an increase in patient severity.

2. Update to the Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

Under § 412.523(c)(3)(ii), for RY 2004 through RY 2006, the annual update to the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate was equal to the most recent estimate of increases in the prices of an appropriate market basket of goods and services included in covered inpatient LTCH services. As noted above in this section, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to include appropriate adjustments in the establishment of the LTCH PPS, for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2006 and on or before June 30, 2007 (RY 2007), we specified at § 412.523(c)(3)(iii) that the standard Federal rate from the previous year would be updated by a factor of zero percent. That is, the standard Federal rate for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year remained the same as the standard Federal rate in effect during the 2006 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) (that is, $38,086.04).

As discussed in greater detail in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27819 through 27827), the update to the standard Federal rate for RY 2007 was determined based on the estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket and an analysis of LTCH case-mix, in conjunction with a review of LTCHs' margins and our ongoing LTCH monitoring activities. Specifically, from our CMI analysis, we calculated the observed CMI increase between FY 2003 and FY 2004 (6.75 percent) and determined that a significant portion of the 6.75 percent increase in CMI between FY 2003 and FY 2004 is due to changes in coding practices, which we define as ''apparent'' increase in case-mix, rather than the treatment of more resource intensive patients. We also noted that the large observed increase in LTCH case-mix was not accompanied by a corresponding increase in Medicare costs. Finally, we noted in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27826 through 27827) that although the most recent update of the market basket discussed in that final rule is 0.2 percent lower than the estimate of the market basket discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we believed that finalizing a zero percent update to the Federal rate for RY 2007 was appropriate for several reasons.

First, we did not believe that there was a significant difference between the most recent estimates of the market basket for RY 2007 (3.4 percent) and the estimate used in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule (3.6 percent). Furthermore, there could be some minimal variation in how much of the observed case-mix increase represents real case-mix changes. Finally, because the proposed update for RY 2007 at § 412.523(c)(3)(iii) explicitly specified that the RY 2007 standard Federal rate would be the previous LTCH PPS rate year updated by an update factor of zero percent, we believe some commenters may not have been aware that the final update for RY 2007 could have been different than (that is, greater than or less than) zero percent. Thus, we believed that the best approach was to adopt an update factor of zero percent in the final rule for RY 2007, which reflected both the market basket estimate and an adjustment to account for the increase in case-mix in a prior period (FY 2004) that resulted from changes in coding practices rather than an increase in patient severity. In that same final rule (71 FR 27821), we stated that the revision to § 412.523(c)(3) only addressed an update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (§ 412.523(c)(3)(iii)), and that we would propose future revisions to § 412.523(c)(3) to address future proposed updates to the LTCH PPS Federal rates in future rate years based on an analysis of the most recent available LTCH data.

In determining the update to the standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we again performed a CMI analysis using the most recent available LTCH claims data and found the observed CMI increase between FY 2004 and FY 2005 to be 3.49 percent. We believe that there is still some component of apparent CMI increase within the observed CMI increase of 3.49 percent that is due to coding practices rather than the treatment of more resource intensive patients (real CMI increase). Therefore, we believe it is appropriate to apply an adjustment to the market basket update for RY 2008 to account for the apparent CMI increase for a subsequent prior period (that is, CMI increase due to changes in coding practices during FY 2005).

Comment: Many commenters urged us to provide the full market basket update rather than finalize the proposed update factor of 0.71 percent. Several commenters maintained that market basket is a measure of the expected increase in price inputs for the upcoming year that raise the cost of resources used in providing care to Medicare patients. Furthermore, some commenters believed that an increase of less than the market basket would not account for the costs of goods and services required to deliver LTCH services and will result in rates below the cost of care.

Response: As we have discussed previously in the RY 2007 final rule (71 FR 27798), as well as throughout this section of the preamble of this final rule, while we continue to believe that an update to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year should be based on the most recent estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket, we also believe it appropriate that the rate be adjusted by an adjustment to account for changes in coding practices. In essence, we updated the standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year by a factor (+3.2 percent) for the full market basket in addition to applying a factor (−2.49 percent) to eliminate the effect of coding or classification changes that do not reflect real changes in LTCHs' case-mix during FY 2005. This adjustment is necessary in order to account for payments that were made based on improved coding (rather than increased patient severity) in a prior year.

We note that MedPAC had recommended a zero percent update for RY 2008 (March 2007 MedPAC Report to Congress, MedPAC Payment Policy, Recommendation 3D, p. 221) and that the proposed update factor of 0.71 percent is higher than what MedPAC had believed appropriate at the time. Therefore, we disagree with the comment that an increase of less than the market basket would not account for the costs of goods and services required

to deliver LTCH services and will result in rates below the cost of care.

Comment: Several commenters noted that in addition to case mix, other elements that would affect the price of inputs include wages, drugs, products, and supplies; therefore, the commenters question our use of ''case-mix as determinative of an appropriate market basket increase.'' A commenter also noted that ''the market basket update is a prospective measure of price inflation, and CMS provides no data suggesting that prices will not increase by 3.2 percent over RY 2008. CMS also does not provide any data showing that prices from 2004 to 2005 and from 2005 to 2006 (years included in the agency's case-mix analysis) increased less than the market basket update amount for those years.'' Consequently, the commenter believed that we have not explained adequately how case mix changes are related to the market basket to warrant a reduction in the full market basket.

Response: We believe these commenters misunderstood our approach in applying the findings from our case mix analysis. First, we do not disagree that the estimated market basket is a prediction of the increase in the costs of goods and services in the coming year. Accordingly, we have based the update to the standard Federal rate each year since RY 2004 on the most recent estimate of the market basket. For RY 2004 through RY 2006, the annual update to the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate was equal to the most recent estimate of the market basket. Beginning in RY 2007, our monitoring activities and CMI analysis determined that a significant portion of the observed increase in CMI between FY 2003 and FY 2004 is due to changes in coding practices, rather than the treatment of more resource intensive patients. Accordingly, we updated the standard Federal rate for RY 2007 based both on the full estimate of market basket and an adjustment to account for the excessive payments that were made based on improved coding (rather than increased patient severity) in a prior period (between FY 2003 and FY 2004) which consequently resulted in a zero percent update. This approach was replicated for RY 2008 which resulted in a net update to the rate for RY 2008 of 0.71 percent.

Comment: Some commenters believed there is no regulatory basis for CMS to adjust the market basket update to account for apparent case-mix increase in a previous year. Specifically, a commenter wrote, ''Other than the availability of data, CMS provides no logical explanation as to why an estimation of the ''apparent'' increase in case-mix derived from FY 2004 and FY 2005 claims should be applied to the market basket increase in RY 2008.'' Furthermore, some commenters believed the proposed update factor of 0.71 percent is not based on verifiable or relevant data.

Response: Section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA conferred upon the Secretary broad discretion to determine the standard rate and make appropriate adjustments to the system. We note that while § 412.523(c)(3) specifies the update to the standard rate for each year since FY 2003, the regulations do not specifically require that the Secretary automatically apply a market basket increase to prospective years. On the contrary, the regulations are to be updated each year to reflect any update to the standard rate as a result of rulemaking. Furthermore, we consistently use the most recent available data to determine the appropriate update factor. Accordingly, for this final rule we used the most recent available data, including the most recent estimate of the RPL market basket for July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, based on Global Insight's 1st quarter 2007 forecast with history through the 4th quarter of 2006, and the case-mix data from FY 2004 compared to FY 2005, to establish the 0.71 percent update factor.

As discussed in detail in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27819 through 27827), in determining the update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate for RY 2007, we used 2.75 percent as the proxy for ''real'' CMI change during RY 2004. We noted in that same final rule (71 FR 27822) that we were aware of a well-established RAND Corporation (RAND) study [''Has DRG Creep Crept Up? Decomposing the Case-Mix Index Change Between 1987 and 1988'' by G. M. Carter, J. P. Newhouse, and D. A. Relles, R–4098–HCFA/ProPAC (1991)]. Based upon such study, we determined that real case-mix change for IPPS hospitals was a fairly steady 1.0 and 1.4 percent per year. We also noted that in updating IPPS rates, we have consistently assumed that real case-mix change was between 1.0 to 1.4 percent per year, which is a more conservative estimate of real case-mix increase than the 2.75 percent used in determining the update to the Federal rate for RY 2007 (71 FR 27822). For further information on the update to the Federal rate for RY 2007, see the RY 2007 final rule (71 FR 27819 through 27827).

For this final rule, the CMI analysis performed in determining the Federal rate update for RY 2008 is based on the observed CMI increase from FY 2004 to FY 2005 (the first and second full years of the LTCH PPS, respectively). We believe that as the LTCH PPS matured and LTCHs have become more familiar with the DRG-based payment system, it is more appropriate to utilize the estimate of real case-mix increase (1.0 percent to 1.4 percent) based on the RAND study that is typically found in acute care hospitals under the IPPS. Furthermore, an analysis of the most recent available LTCH claims data (FY 2005 LTCH claims data from the March 2006 update of the MedPAR files) show a steady decrease in the observed CMI from year to year since FY 2003 (the observed CMI change between FY 2003 and FY 2004 is 6.75 percent, between FY 2004 and FY 2005 is 3.49 percent, and between FY 2005 and FY 2006 is estimated to be 1.9 percent), which suggests that both apparent and real components of CMI are decreasing as the LTCH PPS matures. Given the estimated 1.9 percent observed CMI increase for FY 2006, it appears that it is inappropriate to assume a constant annual real case mix of 2.75 percent.

Therefore, for periods beyond the first full year of the LTCH PPS, we believe it is no longer appropriate to use such a generous estimate of real CMI. (Many LTCHs have cost reporting periods beginning in August and thus were not paid under the LTCH PPS until August 2003. For those hospitals, the first full year of the LTCH PPS was during FY 2004.) While the well-established ''real'' case-mix parameters based on the RAND study are based on IPPS data, we believe they are appropriate to apply under the LTCH PPS for the reasons explained below in this section. In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we solicited comments on other data sources that could be used to determine a proxy for real LTCH PPS case-mix change other than the 1.0 to 1.4 percent per year case-mix parameters based on the RAND study. Although we did not receive any comments suggesting alternative data sources that could be used to determine a proxy for real LTCH PPS case-mix change, we did receive comments pertaining to using 1.0 as the proxy for real case mix.

As we have discussed numerous times in previous LTCH PPS proposed and final rules, acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS and LTCHs paid under the LTCH PPS have much in common. Hospitals paid under both systems are required to meet the same certification criteria set forth in section 1861(e) of the Act to participate as a hospital in the Medicare program. LTCHs are certified as acute care hospitals but are classified as LTCHs for payment purposes solely because such hospitals generally have

an inpatient ALOS of greater than 25 days (as set forth in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act). Furthermore, the LTCH PPS uses the same patient classification system that is used under the IPPS, and several LTCH PPS payment policies, such as the area wage adjustment (§ 412.525(c)), COLA for Alaska and Hawaii (§ 412.525(b)), and high cost outlier (HCO) policy (§ 412.525(a)) are modeled after the similar IPPS policies.

Therefore, we believe it is appropriate to utilize the estimate of real CMI increase based on the RAND study of 1.0 percent as the proxy for the portion of the observed 3.49 percent CMI increase from FY 2004 to FY 2005 that represents real CMI changes for use in determining the proposed RY 2008 Federal rate update. We are using the more conservative 1.0 percent (rather than the 1.4 percent) as a proxy for real CMI increase because it is consistent with what is used under the IPPS and we believe the similarities between LTCHs and acute care hospitals are significant as we explained previously. (For a more detailed discussion on the 1.0 percent for real CMI increase utilized in the IPPS, see the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48156 through 48158), and the FY 1994 IPPS proposed rule (58 FR 30444).) Accordingly, since the observed CMI change for FY 2005 is estimated at 3.49 percent (based on the most recent available LTCH case-mix data from FY 2004 compared to FY 2005), accounting for the real CMI change of 1.0 percent, we believe that 2.49 percent (3.49–1.0 = 2.49) of that increase reflects CMI increase that is due to changes in coding practices (rather than patient severity).

Comment: Some commenters disagreed with our estimate of real case mix increase which is based on a study of acute care hospitals conducted by RAND using claims data from 1987 to 1988. The commenters did not believe the old data from acute care hospitals is relevant to LTCHs.

Response: As we have discussed numerous times in previous LTCH PPS proposed and final rules, as well as in the previous section of this preamble, we continue to believe that acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS and LTCHs paid under the LTCH PPS have much in common. Hospitals paid under both systems are required to meet the same certification criteria set forth in section 1861(e) of the Act to participate as a hospital in the Medicare program. The commenters did not provide any alternative data sources to determine real case mix for LTCHs. Accordingly, we continue to believe that it is appropriate to utilize the same 1.0 percent factor to project real case mix for both, the IPPS and the LTCH PPS.

Comment: Some commenters believed we proposed to use the more conservative estimate of real case-mix increase (1.0 percent) rather than the upper bound based on the RAND study (1.4 percent) without sufficient justification. However, commenters agreed that we requested comments on other data sources that could be used to determine a proxy for real LTCH PPS case-mix changes. While we did not receive any comments providing alternative data sources to determine real case-mix increase, several commenters suggested that the best proxy for real case-mix increase is the observed case-mix increase adjusted to eliminate any provider with atypical case mix changes.

Response: We continue to believe that using the more conservative 1.0 percent (rather than the 1.4 percent) as a proxy for real CMI increase is appropriate because it is consistent with what is used under the IPPS and we believe the similarities between LTCHs and acute care hospitals are significant as we explained previously.

As we discussed in greater detail in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27819 through 27827), while we continue to believe that an update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate year should be based on the most recent estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket, we believe it appropriate that the rate be offset by an adjustment to account for changes in coding practices that do not reflect increased patient severity. Such an adjustment protects the integrity of the Medicare Trust Funds by ensuring that the LTCH PPS payment rates better reflect the true costs of treating LTCH patients (71 FR 27798 through 27820). Therefore, in determining the RY 2008 update to the LTCH PPS Federal rate, we believe it is appropriate to apply an adjustment to eliminate the effect of coding or classification changes in a prior period (FY 2005) that do not reflect real changes in LTCHs' case-mix. Specifically, the case-mix adjustment in determining the RY 2008 Federal rate is meant to reduce current payments to account for the increase in payments in FY 2005 that resulted from the CMI increase that was attributable to the apparent case-mix increase in that year. As was the case when we determined the RY 2007 update factor, this adjustment would be necessary to account for payments that were made based on improved coding (rather than increased patient severity) in prior years. Therefore, in this final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA to include appropriate adjustments, including updates, in the establishment of the LTCH PPS, we are revising § 412.523(c)(3), to specify that, for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 and on or before June 30, 2008, the standard Federal rate from the previous year will be updated by 0.71 percent, which is based on the most recent market basket estimate (3.2 percent) adjusted by the apparent CMI (2.49 percent) due to changes in coding practice rather than an increase in patient severity. As explained above in this section, the update factor for RY 2008 is based on the most recent estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket offset by an adjustment to account for changes in case-mix in prior periods due to changes in coding practices rather than increased patient severity. We note that the update factor of 0.71 percent is higher than the zero percent update recommended by the MedPAC for RY 2008 (MedPAC Public Meeting, January 9, 2007, Meeting Transcript pp. 225–226). In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we solicited comments on a possible zero percent update to the standard Federal rate for RY 2008. While most commenters recommended a full market basket update, we did receive some comments noting that in light of MedPAC's recommendation of a zero percent update, the commenters were pleased that we did not propose to implement a zero percent update and the commenters supported our proposal of a 0.71 percent update.

Furthermore, since we are using the most recent estimates of the market basket and CMI increase in the prior period (FY 2005) for calculating the update factor to the LTCH PPS Federal rate, we noted in the proposed rule that at the time the analysis must be performed for the final rule, we would consider comments received on this proposed rule and would also use the most recent estimates available at that time, if appropriate, which may be different from the data used in the proposed rule. Therefore, we explained that the proposed update factor applied to the standard Federal rate may change in the final rule.

At this time, the most recent estimate of the LTCH PPS market basket remains at 3.2 percent, and based on FY 2005 LTCH claims data from the March 2006 update of the MedPAR files, the most recent estimate of apparent CMI increase in the prior period (FY 2005), that is, case-mix increase due to changes in coding practices, also remains at 2.49 percent. Additionally, since we did not receive any comments suggesting alternative data sources to use in

determining a proxy for real case mix and for the reasons stated previously, we are continuing to use 1.0 percent as the proxy for the real case mix. Therefore, the RY 2008 update factor to the LTCH PPS Federal rate will be 0.71 percent (3.2 − 2.49 = 0.71), which reflects the adjustment to the most recent market basket estimate and accounts for the increase in case-mix in the prior period that resulted from changes in coding practices rather than an increase in patient severity. Accordingly, under the same broad authority conferred upon the Secretary under the BBRA and the BIPA referenced above in this section, we are specifying under § 412.523(c)(3)(iv), that, for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 and on or before June 30, 2008, the standard Federal rate from the previous year would be updated by 0.71 percent, determined based on an adjustment to the most recent estimate of the market basket to account for case-mix increase in the prior period (FY 2005) that is due to changes in coding practices rather than patient severity.

Comment: Numerous commenters stated that we have made changes to the LTCH PPS in the last several years that have slowed the growth in the number of new LTCHs and has controlled margins. The commenters believe that the cumulative effect of these payment changes, including the reweighting of the DRGs in October 2005 and October 2006, the adoption of the original 25 percent rule, the adjustments to the SSO policy, and a zero percent update for RY 2007, has been to bring LTCH margins close to zero. With the addition of the proposed payment changes for RY 2008, the commenters believe that payment to LTCHs will be inadequate. Using our impact analysis table from the proposed rule and MedPAC's estimated margins for FY 2007 as a base for comparison, two commenters attempted to estimate LTCHs' margins for RY 2008. The commenters asserted that, according to their analyses, estimated margins for RY 2008 could be as low as −3.7 percent to −5.7 percent. Numerous commenters expressed concern that the combined effect of changes to the LTCH PPS (from the last 2 years, as well as the proposed changes for RY 2008) would reduce reimbursement below the estimates of costs. Furthermore, one commenter wrote, ''A fundamental premise of the Medicare program and its payment systems is that Medicare should not knowingly reimburse providers and suppliers below the cost of care.''

Response: We acknowledge that the changes to the payment system implemented in the last several years have affected the LTCH industry. In fact, we have observed that LTCHs adapt to our regulatory changes by modifying their business model to maximize profitability while operating under the new changes. For example, when we implemented the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment in FY 2005 for co-located LTCHs and satellites, we are aware that LTCHs shifted emphasis from developing co-located facilities to developing freestanding LTCHs. With the proposed expansion of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment to apply to LTCH or satellite patients that were admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, we anticipate that LTCHs could adapt by increasing the number of admissions of patients that are HCOs from referring hospitals (exempt from the 25 percent rule). In addition, since LTCHs on average get 20 percent of their discharges from sources other than acute care hospitals, it will be possible for LTCHs to adapt by admitting more of those types of patients, thus making it easier for a LTCH to stay within the applicable threshold. We have also been informed by members of the LTCH industry that in places where there are multiple acute care hospitals, the LTCHs will be able to plan their discharges to assure that they do not exceed the threshold.

Consequently, while the commenters have conducted margins analyses based on current LTCH behaviors and assert that our changes may result in negative margins, we do not believe this will prove to be the case. Indeed, commenters made similar allegations in their objection to the changes for RY 2007, and predicted that we would see many LTCHs put out of business due to our drastically-changed policies. In actuality, we did not see a drastic reduction in either the number of LTCHs or the overall number of LTCH cases. Furthermore, reports in trade journals suggest that certain members of the LTCH industry believe they are well situated to expand in the future. Similarly, we believe LTCHs have the ability to screen patients coming to a LTCH to assure that they are truly LTC patients. However, in the case of the revised SSO policy, we believe that a payment, for those patients that have a LOS comparable to an IPPS patient for that DRG (that is, the IPPS comparable threshold) at a level comparable to the IPPS payment, is an appropriate payment.

3. Standard Federal Rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27827), we established a standard Federal rate of $38,086.04 for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year that was based on the best available data and policies established in that final rule. In this final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, consistent with the proposed rule, we are applying an annual update to the standard Federal rate for RY 2008 that reflects an adjustment for the most recent market basket estimate and an adjustment to account for the increase in case-mix in a prior period (FY 2005) that resulted from changes in coding practices rather than an increase in patient severity. Therefore, based on the update factor for RY 2008 of 0.71 percent, the standard Federal rate for RY 2008 will be $38,356.45. Since the standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year has already been adjusted for differences in case-mix, wages, COLAs, and HCO payments, we are not making any additional adjustments in the standard Federal rate for these factors.

D. Calculation of LTCH Prospective Payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

The basic methodology for determining prospective payment rates for LTCH inpatient operating and capital-related costs is set forth in § 412.515 through § 412.532. In accordance with § 412.515, we assign appropriate weighting factors to each LTC–DRG to reflect the estimated relative cost of hospital resources used for discharges within that group as compared to discharges classified within other groups. The amount of the prospective payment is based on the standard Federal rate, established under § 412.523, and adjusted for the LTC–DRG relative weights, differences in area wage levels, COLA in Alaska and Hawaii, HCOs, and other special payment provisions (SSOs under § 412.529 and interrupted stays under § 412.531).

In accordance with § 412.533, during the 5-year transition period, which is currently in its final year for LTCH cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006 (FY 2007), a total LTCH PPS payment was based on the applicable transition blend percentage of the adjusted Federal rate and a percentage based on reasonable cost principles, unless the LTCH made a one-time election to receive payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate.

In the final year of the 5-year transition period, which began with LTCH cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, as specified at § 412.533, a total LTCH PPS payment is based on 100 percent of the Federal rate. An LTCH defined as ''new'' under § 412.23(e)(4) is paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate with no blended transition payments as specified in § 412.533(d). As discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56038), the applicable transition blends are set forth in § 412.533(a).

Accordingly, for cost reporting periods that began during FY 2006 (that is, on or after October 1, 2005 and on or before September 30, 2006), blended payments under the transition methodology were based on 20 percent of the LTCH's rate based on reasonable cost principles and 80 percent of the adjusted LTCH PPS Federal rate. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006 (FY 2007), Medicare payment to LTCHs are determined entirely (100 percent) under the LTCH PPS Federal rate.

1. Adjustment for Area Wage Levels

a. Background

Under the authority of section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, we established an adjustment to the LTCH PPS Federal rate to account for differences in LTCH area wage levels at § 412.525(c). The labor-related share of the LTCH PPS Federal rate, currently estimated by the FY 2002-based RPL market basket (as discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.1.c. of this preamble), is adjusted to account for geographic differences in area wage levels by applying the applicable LTCH PPS wage index. The applicable LTCH PPS wage index is computed using wage data from inpatient acute care hospitals without regard to reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) or 1886(d)(10) of the Act. Furthermore, as we discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56015), we established a 5-year transition to the full wage adjustment. The applicable wage index phase-in percentages are based on the start of an LTCH's cost reporting period as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Cost reporting periods beginning on or after	Phase-in percentage of the full wage index
October 1, 2002	1/5th (20 percent).
October 1, 2003	2/5ths (40 percent).
October 1, 2004	3/5ths (60 percent).
October 1, 2005	4/5ths (80 percent).
October 1, 2006	5/5ths (100 percent).

For example, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2005 and on or before September 30, 2006 (FY 2006), the applicable LTCH wage index value is four-fifths of the applicable full LTCH PPS wage index value. The wage index adjustment will be completely phased-in beginning with cost reporting periods beginning in FY 2007, that is, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, the applicable LTCH wage index value will be the full (five-fifths) LTCH PPS wage index value. Therefore, the majority of LTCHs are currently receiving either the four-fifths or full (five-fifths) LTCH PPS wage index value. As we established in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56018), the applicable full LTCH PPS wage index value is calculated from acute-care hospital inpatient wage index data without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act.

b. Geographic Classifications/Labor Market Area Definitions

As discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule, which implemented the LTCH PPS (67 FR 56015 through 56019), in establishing an adjustment for area wage levels under § 412.525(c), the labor-related portion of a LTCH's Federal prospective payment is adjusted by using an appropriate wage index based on the labor market area in which the LTCH is located. In the 2006 LTCH PPS rate year final rule (70 FR 24184 through 24185), in § 412.525(c), we revised the labor market area definitions used under the LTCH PPS effective for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2005 based on the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) designations based on 2000 Census data because we believe that those new labor market area definitions will ensure that the LTCH PPS wage index adjustment most appropriately accounts for and reflects the relative hospital wage levels in the geographic area of the hospital as compared to the national average hospital wage level. As set forth in § 412.525(c)(2), a LTCH's wage index is determined based on the location of the LTCH in an urban or rural area as defined in § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(A) through (C). An urban area under the LTCH PPS is defined at § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(A) and (B). In general, an urban area is defined as a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) as defined by the OMB. (In addition, a few counties located outside of MSAs are considered urban as specified at § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(B).) Under § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(C), a rural area is defined as any area outside of an urban area.

We note that these are the same CBSA-based designations implemented for acute care inpatient hospitals under the IPPS at § 412.64(b) effective October 1, 2004 (69 FR 49026 through 49034). For further discussion of the labor market area (geographic classification) definitions used under the LTCH PPS, see the 2006 LTCH PPS rate year final rule (70 FR 24182 through 24191).

c. Labor-Related Share

In the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56016), we established a labor-related share of 72.885 percent based on the relative importance of the labor-related share of operating costs (wages and salaries, employee benefits, professional fees, postal services, and all other labor-intensive services) and capital costs of the excluded hospital with capital market basket based on FY 1992 data.

As we discussed in LTCH PPS final rules subsequent to the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule in which we established the original LTCH PPS labor-related share (68 FR 34142, 69 FR 25685 through 25686, and 70 FR 24182), once our research into the labor-related share methodology was complete, we would update the IPPS and excluded hospital labor-related shares based on that research and the best available data if necessary. Accordingly, we conducted analysis of our labor share methodology, which was completed prior to the development of the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed and final rules. In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27829), we updated the LTCH PPS labor-related share based on the FY 2002-based RPL market basket (discussed in section IV.B. of this preamble) because we believe that this market basket was developed based on the best available data that reflect the cost structures of LTCHs.

Consistent with our historical practice, the labor-related share currently used under the LTCH PPS is determined by identifying the national average proportion of operating costs and capital costs that are related to, influenced by, or vary with the local labor market. Specifically, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27829 through 27832), we revised the LTCH PPS labor-related share from 72.885

percent (as established in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56016) based on the FY 1997-based excluded hospital with capital market basket) to 75.665 percent based on the relative importance of the labor-related share of operating costs (wages and salaries, employee benefits, professional fees, and all other labor-intensive services) and capital costs of the proposed RPL market basket based on FY 2002 data from the first quarter of 2006.

In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4794), under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, consistent with our historical practice of determining the labor-related share by identifying the national average proportion of operating costs and capital costs that are related to, influenced by, or varies with the local labor market, and consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available, we proposed to update the LTCH PPS labor-related share from 75.665 percent to 75.511 percent based on the relative importance of the labor-related share of operating costs (wages and salaries, employee benefits, professional fees, and all other labor-intensive services) and capital costs of the FY 2002-based RPL market basket from the 3rd quarter of 2006. The labor-related share is the sum of the relative importance of wages and salaries, fringe benefits, professional fees, labor-intensive services, and a portion of the capital share from an appropriate market basket. We received no comments on our proposal to update the LTCH PPS labor-related share.

Consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available, we also proposed that if more recent data were available to determine the labor-related share of the RPL market basket (used under the LTCH PPS), we would use such data for determining the labor-related share for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year in the final rule. As discussed above in section IV.B.2. of this preamble, we now have data from the 1st quarter of 2007 (with history through the 4th quarter of 2006). Therefore, in this final rule, for RY 2008, we are using the FY 2002-based RPL market basket costs based on data from the 1st quarter of 2007 to determine the labor-related share for the LTCH PPS effective for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007, as this is the most recent available data. The labor-related share for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year will continue to be the sum of the relative importance of each labor-related cost category, and will reflect the different rates of price change for these cost categories between the base year (FY 2002) and the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Accordingly, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, consistent with our historical practice of determining the labor-related share by identifying the national average proportion of operating costs and capital costs that are related to, influenced by, or varies with the local labor market, we are revising the LTCH PPS labor-related share from 75.665 percent to 75.788 percent based on the relative importance of the labor-related share of operating costs (wages and salaries, employee benefits, professional fees, and all other labor-intensive services) and capital costs of the FY 2002-based RPL market basket from the 1st quarter of 2007, as discussed below and shown below in Table 2.

Based on the most recent available data, the sum of the relative importance for 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for operating costs (wages and salaries, employee benefits, professional fees, and labor-intensive services) is 71.767, as shown in Table 2. The portion of capital that is influenced by the local labor market is still estimated to be 46 percent, which is the same percentage used when we established the current labor-related share in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule. Since, based on the most recent available data, the relative importance for capital is 8.742 percent of the FY 2002-based RPL market basket for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we are multiplying the estimated portion of capital influenced by the local labor market (46 percent) by the relative importance for capital (8.742 percent) to determine the labor-related share of capital for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. The result is 4.021 percent (0.46×8.742 percent), which we add to the 71.767 percent for the operating cost amount to determine the total labor-related share for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Thus, based on the latest available data, we are establishing a labor-related share of 75.788 percent (71.767 percent + 4.021 percent) under the LTCH PPS for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. As noted above in this section, this labor-related share is determined using the same methodology as employed in calculating the current LTCH labor-related share (71 FR 27830) and the labor-related shares used under the IRF PPS and IPF PPS, which also use the RPL market basket.

Table 2 shows the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year relative importance labor-related share of the FY 2002-based RPL market basket (established in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule) and the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year relative importance labor-related share of the FY 2002-based RPL market basket.

TABLE 2.—RY 2007 LABOR-RELATED SHARE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AND RY 2008 LABOR-RELATED SHARE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE FY 2002-BASED RPL MARKET BASKET

Cost category	RY 2007 relative importance*	RY 2008 relative importance
Wages and Salaries	52.506	52.588
Employee Benefits	14.042	14.127
Professional fees	2.886	2.907
All other labor intensive services	2.152	2.145
Subtotal	71.586	71.767
Labor share of capital costs	4.079	4.021
Total Labor-related share	75.665	75.788

* As established in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27830).

** Other labor intensive services includes landscaping services, services to buildings, detective and protective services, repair services, laundry services, advertising, auto parking and repairs, physical fitness facilities, and other government enterprises.

d. Wage Index Data

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27830 through 27831), we established LTCH PPS wage index values for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year calculated from the same data (generated in cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2002) used to compute the FY 2006 acute care hospital inpatient wage index data without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act because that was the best available data at that time. The LTCH wage index values applicable for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 are shown in Table 1 (for urban areas) and Table 2 (for rural areas) in the Addendum to the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27906 through 27930). Acute care hospital inpatient wage index data are also used to establish the wage index adjustment used in the IRF PPS, HHA PPS, and SNF PPS. As we discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56019), since hospitals that are excluded from the IPPS are not required to provide wage-related information on the Medicare cost report and because we would need to establish instructions for the collection of this LTCH data to establish a geographic reclassification adjustment under the LTCH PPS, the wage adjustment established under the LTCH PPS is based on a LTCH's actual location without regard to the urban or rural designation of any related or affiliated provider.

In the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4795–4796), under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to determine appropriate adjustments under the LTCH PPS, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we proposed to use the same data (generated in cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003) used to compute the FY 2007 acute care hospital inpatient wage index data without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act to determine the applicable wage index values under the LTCH PPS because these data (FY 2003) are the most recent complete data. We proposed to continue to use IPPS wage data as a proxy to determine the LTCH wage index values for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year because both LTCHs and acute-care hospitals are required to meet the same certification criteria set forth in section 1861(e) of the Act to participate as a hospital in the Medicare program and they both compete in the same labor markets, and, therefore, experience similar wage-related costs. These data are the same FY 2003 acute care hospital inpatient wage data that were used to compute the FY 2007 wage indices currently used under the IPPS, skilled nursing facility (SNF) PPS and home health agency (HHA) PPS. The LTCH wage index values that would be applicable for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, are shown in Table 1 (for urban areas) and Table 2 (for rural areas) in Addendum A to the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4849 through 4872).

We received no comments on the proposed LTCH wage index values that would be applicable for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. Therefore, in this final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to determine appropriate adjustments under the LTCH PPS, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we are using the same data (generated in cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003) used to compute the FY 2007 acute care hospital inpatient wage index data without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act to determine the applicable wage index values under the LTCH PPS because these data (FY 2003) are the most recent complete data. We are continuing to use IPPS wage data as a proxy to determine the LTCH wage index values for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for the reasons stated in the RY 2008 proposed rule (as noted above). The LTCH wage index values that will be applicable for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, are shown in Table 1 (for urban areas) and Table 2 (for rural areas) in the Addendum to this final rule.

As discussed in section IV.D.1.a. of this preamble, the applicable wage index phase-in percentages are based on the start of a LTCH's cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1st of each year during the 5-year transition period. Thus, cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2005 and before October 1, 2006 (FY 2006), the labor-related portion of the standard Federal rate is adjusted by four-fifths of the applicable LTCH wage index value. The wage index adjustment will be completely phased-in beginning with cost reporting periods beginning in FY 2007. That is, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, the labor-related portion of the standard Federal rate is adjusted by the full (five-fifths) applicable LTCH wage index value.

Because the phase-in of the wage index does not coincide with the LTCH PPS rate year (July 1st through June 30th), most LTCHs will experience a change in the wage index phase-in percentages during the LTCH PPS rate year. For example, during the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, for a LTCH with a September 1st fiscal year, the four-fifths wage index will be applicable for the first 2 months of the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007 through August 31, 2007) and the full (five-fifths) wage index will be applicable for the next 10 months of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (September 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008). For the remainder of such a LTCH's FY 2006 cost reporting periods, which coincides with the first 2 months of RY 2008, the applicable wage index value would be four-fifths of the full FY 2007 acute-care hospital inpatient wage index data, without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act (as shown in Tables 1 and 2 in the Addendum to this final rule). Beginning with this LTCH's FY 2007 cost reporting period that will begin during RY 2008, the applicable wage index value would be the full (five-fifths) FY 2007 acute care hospital inpatient wage index data, without taking into account geographic reclassification under sections 1886(d)(8) and (d)(10) of the Act (as shown in Tables 1 and 2 in the Addendum to this final rule). We note that since there are no longer any LTCHs in their cost reporting periods that began during FY 2003 through FY 2005 (the first three years of the 5–year wage index phase-in), we are no longer showing the $\frac{1}{5}^{th}$, $\frac{2}{5}^{ths}$ and $\frac{3}{5}^{ths}$ wage index values in Tables 1 and 2 in the Addendum to this final rule.

2. Adjustment for Cost-of-Living in Alaska and Hawaii

In the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56022), we established, under § 412.525(b), a COLA for LTCHs located in Alaska and Hawaii to account for the higher costs incurred in those States. In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27832), for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year, we established a COLA to payments for LTCHs located in Alaska and Hawaii by multiplying the standard Federal payment rate by the appropriate factor listed in Table 8 of that same final rule.

Similarly, in the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4796), under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to determine appropriate adjustments under the

LTCH PPS, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year we proposed to apply a COLA to payments to LTCHs located in Alaska and Hawaii by multiplying the proposed standard Federal payment rate by the factors listed in Table 3 of that proposed rule because those were the most recent available data at that time. Those factors were obtained from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and are currently used under the IPPS. In addition, we proposed that if OPM released revised COLA factors before March 1, 2007, we would use them for the development of the payments for the 2008 LTCH rate year and publish them in the LTCH PPS final rule.

We received no comments on our proposed COLA factors for LTCHs located in Alaska and Hawaii for RY 2008. However, we note that OPM released revised COLA factors for certain areas in Alaska prior to March 1, 2007. Specifically, OPM released revised COLA factors for the city of Anchorage and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road, the city of Fairbanks and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road, and the city of Juneau and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road. The COLA factors for all other areas of Alaska were not revised from their current values. (We note that currently there are no LTCHs located in Alaska.)

Therefore, in this final rule were are adopting the revised COLA factors for those areas in Alaska, along with the proposed COLA factors for the other areas of Alaska and Hawaii, for use under the LTCH PPS in RY 2008. We note that the revised COLA factors for certain areas of Alaska have been proposed for use under the IPPS for FY 2008, as discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.

In this final rule, under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to determine appropriate adjustments under the LTCH PPS, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year we are applying a COLA to payments to LTCHs located in Alaska and Hawaii by multiplying the standard Federal payment rate by the factors listed below in Table 3 because these are currently the most recent available data from OPM (as noted above).

TABLE 3.—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT FACTORS FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII HOSPITALS FOR THE 2008 LTCH PPS RATE YEAR

Alaska:	
City of Anchorage and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road	1.24
City of Fairbanks and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road	1.24
City of Juneau and 80-kilometer (50-mile) radius by road	1.24
All other areas of Alaska	1.25
Hawaii:	
Honolulu County	1.25
Hawaii County	1.165
Kauai County	1.2325
Maui County	1.2375
Kalawao County	1.2375

3. Adjustment for High-Cost Outliers (HCOs)

a. Background

Under the broad authority conferred upon the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA, in the regulations at § 412.525(a), we established an adjustment for additional payments for outlier cases that have extraordinarily high costs relative to the costs of most discharges. Providing additional payments for outliers strongly improves the accuracy of the LTCH PPS in determining resource costs at the patient and hospital level. These additional payments reduce the financial losses that would otherwise be incurred when treating patients who require more costly care and, therefore, reduce the incentives to underserve these patients. We set the outlier threshold before the beginning of the applicable rate year so that total estimated outlier payments are projected to equal 8 percent of total estimated payments under the LTCH PPS. Outlier payments under the LTCH PPS are determined consistent with the IPPS outlier policy.

Under § 412.525(a), we make outlier payments for any discharges if the estimated cost of a case exceeds the adjusted LTCH PPS payment for the LTC–DRG plus a fixed-loss amount. The fixed-loss amount is the amount used to limit the loss that a hospital will incur under the outlier policy for a case with unusually high costs. This results in Medicare and the LTCH sharing financial risk in the treatment of extraordinarily costly cases. Under the LTCH PPS HCO policy, the LTCH's loss is limited to the fixed-loss amount and a fixed percentage of costs above the outlier threshold (LTCH DRG payment plus the fixed-loss amount) determined by the marginal cost factor. We calculate the estimated cost of a case by multiplying the overall hospital cost-to-charge ratio (CCR) by the Medicare allowable covered charge. In accordance with § 412.525(a)(3), we pay outlier cases 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the patient case and the outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount).

Under the LTCH PPS, we determine a fixed-loss amount, that is, the maximum loss that a LTCH can incur under the LTCH PPS for a case with unusually high costs before the LTCH will receive any additional payments. We calculate the fixed-loss amount by estimating aggregate payments with and without an outlier policy. The fixed-loss amount will result in estimated total outlier payments being projected to be equal to 8 percent of projected total LTCH PPS payments. Currently, MedPAR claims data and CCRs based on data from the most recent provider specific file (PSF) (or to the applicable Statewide average CCR if a LTCH's CCR data are faulty or unavailable) are used to establish a fixed-loss threshold amount under the LTCH PPS.

b. Cost-to-Charge Ratios (CCRs)

In determining outlier payments, we calculate the estimated cost of the case by multiplying the LTCH's overall CCR by the Medicare allowable charges for the case. As we discussed in greater detail in the June 9, 2003 IPPS HCO final rule (68 FR 34506 through 34516), because the LTCH PPS HCO policy at § 412.525 is modeled after the IPPS outlier policy, we believed that it and the SSO policy at § 412.529 are susceptible to the same payment vulnerabilities that became evident under the IPPS and, therefore, merited revision. Thus, we revised the HCO policy at § 412.525(a) and the SSO policy at § 412.529 in that same final rule for the determination of LTCHs' CCRs and the reconciliation of outlier payments.

Under the LTCH PPS, a single prospective payment per discharge is made for both inpatient operating and capital-related costs, and, therefore, we compute a single ''overall'' or ''total'' CCR for LTCHs based on the sum of their operating and capital costs (as described in Chapter 3, section 150.24, of the Medicare Claims Processing Manual (CMS Pub. 100–4)) as compared to total charges. Specifically, a LTCH's CCR is calculated by dividing a LTCH's total Medicare costs (that is, the sum of its operating and capital inpatient routine and ancillary costs) by its total Medicare charges (that is, the sum of its operating and capital inpatient routine and ancillary charges). (Instructions regarding the changes established in the

June 9, 2003 IPPS HCO final rule for both LTCHs and IPPS hospitals can be found in Transmittal A–03–058 (Change Request 2785; July 3, 2003).)

As a result of the changes established in the June 9, 2003 IPPS HCO final rule, as we discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27832 through 27833) and the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119 through 48121), a LTCH is assigned the applicable Statewide average CCR if, among other things, a LTCH's CCR is found to be in excess of the applicable maximum CCR threshold (that is, the LTCH CCR ceiling). As we explained in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117), CCRs above this threshold are most likely due to faulty data reporting or entry, and, therefore, these CCRs should not be used to identify and make payments for outlier cases. Such data are clearly errors and should not be relied upon. Thus, under our established policy, if a LTCH's CCR is above the applicable ceiling, the applicable LTCH PPS Statewide average CCR is assigned to the LTCH instead of the CCR computed from its most recent (settled or tentatively settled) cost report data.

Under § 412.525(a)(4)(ii), for discharges occurring on or after August 8, 2003, and before October 1, 2006, we determined the applicable LTCH PPS Statewide average CCRs using the ''combined'' IPPS operating and capital Statewide average CCRs (that is, adding the separate IPPS operating and capital CCRs together to determine the LTCH PPS Statewide average CCRs). Also, under § 412.525(a)(4)(ii), for discharges occurring on or after August 8, 2003, and before October 1, 2006, if a LTCH's CCR is above the applicable ''combined'' IPPS operating and capital ceiling (that is, adding the separate IPPS operating and capital CCR ceiling together), the applicable Statewide average CCR may be assigned to the LTCH.

As we explained in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117 through 48121), we revised our methodology for determining the annual CCR ceiling and Statewide average CCRs under the LTCH PPS because we believe that those changes are consistent with the LTCH PPS single payment rate for inpatient operating and capital costs. Therefore, under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, in that same final rule, we revised our methodology used to determine the LTCH CCR ceiling. For discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, we established that the LTCH CCR ceiling specified under § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(C)(*2*) is calculated as three standard deviations above the corresponding national geometric mean total CCR (established and published annually by CMS). (The fiscal intermediary (FI) may use a Statewide average CCR if, among other things, a LTCH's CCR is in excess of the LTCH CCR ceiling.) The LTCH total CCR ceiling is determined based on IPPS CCR data, by first calculating the ''total'' (that is, operating and capital) IPPS CCR for each hospital and then determining the average ''total'' IPPS CCR for all IPPS hospitals. (Our rationale for using IPPS hospital data is discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117) and reiterated below in this section.) The LTCH CCR ceiling is then established at 3 standard deviations from the corresponding national geometric mean total CCR. (For further detail on our methodology for annually determining the LTCH CCR ceiling, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117 through 48119).) We also established that the LTCH ''total'' CCR ceiling used under the LTCH PPS will continue to be published annually in the IPPS proposed and final rules, and the public should continue to consult the annual IPPS proposed and final rules for changes to the LTCH total CCR ceiling that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1 each year. Accordingly, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119), we established a FY 2007 LTCH PPS total CCR ceiling of 1.321, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006. (We note that the proposed FY 2008 LTCH PPS total CCR ceiling, that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2007, was presented in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.)

In addition, under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we revised our methodology to determine the Statewide average CCRs under § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(C) for use under the LTCH PPS in a manner similar to the way we compute the ''total'' CCR ceiling using IPPS CCR data (71 FR 48120). Specifically, under this revised methodology we first calculate the total (that is, operating and capital) CCR for each IPPS hospital. We then calculate the weighted average ''total'' CCR for all IPPS hospitals in the rural areas of the State and the weighted average ''total'' CCR for all IPPS hospitals in the urban areas of the State. (For further detail on our methodology for annually determining the LTCH urban and rural Statewide average CCRs, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119 through 48121).) We also established that the applicable Statewide average ''total'' (operating and capital) CCRs used under the LTCH PPS will continue to be published annually in the IPPS proposed and final rules, and the public should continue to consult the annual IPPS proposed and final rules for changes to the applicable Statewide average total CCRs that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1 each year. Accordingly, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48122), the FY 2007 LTCH PPS Statewide average total CCRs for urban and rural hospitals, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, were presented in Table 8C of the Addendum of that final rule (71 FR 48303.) (We note that the proposed FY 2007 LTCH PPS Statewide average total CCRs for urban and rural hospitals, that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2007, were presented in Table 8C of the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule.)

As we explained in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117), we continue to believe it is appropriate to use IPPS operating and capital CCRs to compute the LTCH total CCR ceiling and the Statewide average CCRs because LTCHs' cost and charge structures are similar to that of IPPS acute-care hospitals. For instance, LTCHs are certified as acute care hospitals, as set forth in section 1861(e) of the Act to participate as a hospital in the Medicare program, and these hospitals, in general, are paid as LTCHs only because their Medicare ALOS is greater than 25 days as specified in § 412.23(e). Furthermore, prior to qualifying as a LTCH under § 412.23(e)(2)(i), a hospital generally is paid as an acute-care hospital under the IPPS during the period in which it demonstrates that it has an ALOS of greater than 25 days. In addition, since there are less than 400 LTCHs, which are unevenly geographically distributed throughout the United States, there may not be sufficient LTCH CCR data to determine an appropriate LTCH PPS CCR ceiling using LTCH data.

In the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, in addition to revising our methodology for determining the annual CCR ceiling and Statewide average CCRs under the LTCH PPS for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we revised § 412.525(a)(4)(iv) for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, to codify in 42 CFR part 412, subpart O the remaining LTCH PPS outlier policy changes that were established in the June 9, 2003 IPPS HCO final rule (68 FR 34506 through 34513), including modifications and editorial clarifications to those existing policies

established in that final rule. We made these revisions because we believe that they more precisely describe the application of those policies as they relate to the determination of LTCH CCRs because these changes are consistent with the changes to the calculation of the LTCH CCR ceiling.

Specifically, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119), under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we established under the LTCH PPS HCO policy at § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(C) that the FI may use a Statewide average CCR, which is established annually by CMS, if it is unable to determine an accurate CCR for a LTCH in one of the following three circumstances: (1) New LTCHs that have not yet submitted their first Medicare cost report (for this purpose, consistent with current policy, a new LTCH would be defined as an entity that has not accepted assignment of an existing hospital's provider agreement in accordance with § 489.18); (2) LTCHs whose CCR is in excess of the LTCH CCR ceiling; and (3) other LTCHs for whom data with which to calculate a CCR are not available (for example, missing or faulty data). (Other sources of data that the FI may consider in determining a LTCH's CCR included data from a different cost reporting period for the LTCH, data from the cost reporting period preceding the period in which the hospital began to be paid as a LTCH (that is, the period of at least 6 months that it was paid as a short-term acute care hospital), or data from other comparable LTCHs, such as LTCHs in the same chain or in the same region.)

Additionally, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48121), we established under § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(B) and § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(B) that, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, the CCR applied at the time a claim is processed will be based on either the most recently settled cost report or the most recent tentatively settled cost report, whichever is from the latest cost reporting period. Under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, in that same final rule, we also established at § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(A) that, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, we may specify an alternative to the CCR computed under § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(B) (that is, computed from the most recently settled cost report or the most recent tentatively settled cost report, whichever is later), or a hospital may also request that the FI use a different (higher or lower) CCR based on substantial evidence presented by the hospital. In addition, under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we revised § 412.525(a)(3) to change the plural reference from cost-to-charge ''ratios'' to the singular reference to a cost-to-charge ''ratio'' in that final rule. For a complete discussion on all these revisions to our methodology for determining a LTCH's CCR, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119 through 48121). We note that in that same FY 2007 IPPS final rule, we made similar revisions to the SSO policy at § 412.529(c)(3), as discussed in V.A.1.b. of the preamble of this proposed rule.

Comment: A commenter asked that we consider making an exception to the outlier payment reconciliation requirements for the affected hospitals by Hurricane Katrina because they would have experienced an aberrant change in their CCR during the first and second cost reporting periods that began on or after August 29, 2005.

Response: In order for a hospital to meet the requirements of outlier reconciliation, a 10 percentage point change in a LTCHs CCRs from the time of payment to the time of cost report settlement is required in addition to SSO and HCO payment being greater then $500,000 for the cost reporting period being settled. Without further explanation from the commenter, it is not clear what type of aberrant changes to the CCR the commenter is referring. Changes to costs or charges can either result in reducing or increasing a CCR in any given cost reporting period. Based on the events of Katrina, we would anticipate an increase in costs and a reduction in total charges as effected hospitals probably experienced fewer discharges in the period after Katrina. These types of changes would increase a hospital's CCR, and therefore, a hospital would not owe CMS additional funds if a hospital met the criteria for reconciliation. We also note that even if a unique circumstance arose as a result of Hurricane Katrina and resulted in a situation where a hospital would be required to pay CMS as a result of a reconciliation, we believe the existing regulation may allow us to consider the unique needs of this hospital, and no changes to the existing regulations at § 412.525(a)(4)(ii), § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(D), § 412.529(c)(3)(ii), or § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(E).

c. Establishment of the Fixed-Loss Amount

When we implemented the LTCH PPS, as discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56022 through 56026), under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA, we established a fixed-loss amount so that total estimated outlier payments are projected to equal 8 percent of total estimated payments under the LTCH PPS. To determine the fixed-loss amount, we estimate outlier payments and total LTCH PPS payments for each case using claims data from the MedPAR files. Specifically, to determine the outlier payment for each case, we estimate the cost of the case by multiplying the Medicare covered charges from the claim by the LTCH's hospital specific CCR. Under § 412.525(a)(3), if the estimated cost of the case exceeds the outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount), we pay an outlier payment equal to 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the case and the outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount).

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27838), in calculating the fixed-loss amount that would result in estimated outlier payments projected to be equal to 8 percent of total estimated payments for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year, we used claims data from the December 2005 update of the FY 2005 MedPAR files and CCRs from the December 2005 update of the PSF, as that was the best available data at that time. We believe that CCRs from the PSF are the best available CCR data for determining estimated LTCH PPS payments for a given LTCH PPS rate year because they are the most recently available CCRs actually used to make LTCH PPS payments.

As we also discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS rate year final rule (71 FR 27838), we calculated a single fixed-loss amount for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year based on the version 23.0 of the GROUPER, which was the version in effect as of the beginning of the LTCH PPS rate year (that is, July 1, 2006 for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year). In addition, we applied the outlier policy under § 412.525(a) in determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year; that is, we assigned the applicable Statewide average CCR only to LTCHs whose CCRs exceeded the ceiling (and not when they fell below the floor). Accordingly, we used the FY 2006 LTCH PPS CCR ceiling of 1.423 (71 FR 27838). As noted in that same final rule, in determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year using the CCRs from the PSF, there were no LTCHs with missing CCRs or with CCRs in excess of the current ceiling and, therefore, there was no need for us to independently assign the applicable Statewide average CCR to any LTCHs in

determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (as this may have already been done by the FI in the PSF in accordance with the established policy).

Accordingly, in 2007 LTCH PPS rate year final rule (71 FR 27838), we established a fixed-loss amount of $14,887 for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year. Thus, we pay an outlier case 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the case and the outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted Federal LTCH PPS payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount of $14,887).

In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4798 through 4799), for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we used the March 2006 update of the FY 2005 MedPAR claims data to determine a fixed-loss amount that would result in estimated outlier payments projected to be equal to 8 percent of total estimated payments, based on the policies described in that proposed rule, because those data are the most recent complete LTCH data available. Consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available, we also proposed that if more recent LTCH claims data become available, we would to use it for determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year in the final rule. In addition, we determined the proposed fixed-loss amount based on the version of the GROUPER that would be in effect as of the beginning of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007), that is, Version 24.0 of the GROUPER (as established in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47973)).

In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4799), we proposed to use CCRs from the June 2006 update of the PSF for determining the proposed fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as they are currently the most recent complete available data. Consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available, we also proposed that if more recent CCR data are available, we would use it for determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year in the final rule. As we discussed in that same proposed rule, in determining the proposed fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we used the current FY 2007 applicable LTCH ''total'' CCR ceiling of 1.321 and LTCH Statewide average ''total'' CCRs established under our revised methodology in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48118 and 48121) such that the current applicable Statewide average CCR would be assigned if, among other things, a LTCH's CCR exceeded the current ceiling (1.321). We noted that in determining the proposed fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year using the CCRs from the June 2006 update of the PSF, there was no need for us to independently assign the applicable Statewide average CCR to any LTCHs (as this may have already been done by the FI in the PSF in accordance with our established policy).

Accordingly, based on the data and policies described in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we proposed to apply a fixed-loss amount of $18,774 for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Thus, we proposed to pay an outlier case 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the case and the proposed outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted proposed Federal LTCH payment for the LTC–DRG and the proposed fixed-loss amount of $18,774).

In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4799 through 4800), we noted that the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year is higher than the current fixed-loss amount of $14,887. We also discussed that we were not proposing to adjust the existing 8 percent outlier target or 80 percent marginal cost factor under the current LTCH PPS HCO policy at that time. However, we explained that we continue to be interested in any comments that would support revisiting the analysis that was used to establish the existing 8 percent outlier target and the existing 80 percent marginal cost factor, using the most recent available data to evaluate whether any changes to the current HCO policy should be made, and therefore, may result in less of an increase in the fixed-loss amount for RY 2008.

Comment: While we received no comments in support of revisiting the analysis that was used to establish the existing 8 percent outlier target and the existing 80 percent marginal cost factor, using the most recent available data, to evaluate whether any changes to the current HCO policy should be made, some commenters expressed concern over the impact of raising the fixed-loss threshold for HCOs to $18,774, an increase of $3,887 over the RY 2007 threshold. According to one commenter's analysis, the proposed fixed-loss threshold would mean that 26 percent of cases would no longer meet the HCO threshold for receiving additional payments. Specifically, a commenter wrote, ''reducing access to HCO payments for this many cases is not warranted.''

Response: As we explained in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4799), in addition to being based on the most recent available LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case, the proposed change in the fixed-loss amount is primarily due to the projected decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that is expected to result from the approach discussed for the SSO policy under § 412.529, in conjunction with the proposed changes to the area wage adjustment and the proposed changes to the LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2007. In that same proposed rule, we also explained that we believe that an increase in the fixed-loss amount is appropriate and necessary to maintain the requirement that estimated outlier payments would be projected to be equal to 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments, as required under § 412.525(a), because of the estimated decrease in aggregate LTCH PPS payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Based on the regression analysis that was performed when we implemented the LTCH PPS, we established the outlier target at 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments to allow us to achieve a balance between the ''conflicting considerations of the need to protect hospitals with costly cases, while maintaining incentives to improve overall efficiency'' (67 FR 56024). That regression analysis also showed that additional increments of outlier payments over 8 percent (that is, raising the outlier target to a larger percentage than 8 percent) would reduce financial risk, but by successively smaller amounts. Outlier payments are budget neutral, and therefore, outlier payments are funded by prospectively reducing the non-outlier PPS payment rates by projected total outlier payments. The higher the outlier target, the greater the (prospective) reduction to the base payment would need to be applied to the Federal rate to maintain budget neutrality.

Maintaining the fixed-loss amount at the current level would result in HCO payments that exceed the current regulatory requirement that estimated outlier payments would be projected to equal 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments. In fact, our analysis shows that if we were to keep the fixed-loss amount at the current amount of $14,887, we project that estimated outlier payments would be over 10 percent of total estimated LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. As noted above, the results of our regression analysis concluded that an outlier target in excess of 8 percent would not allow us to achieve our stated goal of the HCO policy of balancing the need to protect hospitals with costly cases, while providing an incentive for hospitals to operate efficiently.

We also note that we received no comments in support of revisiting the regression analysis to evaluate whether current LTCH data would support a change in the current HCO policy, such as increasing (or decreasing) the outlier target. While we understand the commenter's concern that raising the fixed-loss threshold would mean that fewer cases would qualify to receive additional payments for extraordinarily high cost, as discussed above, we would have to reduce the standard Federal rate to account for the additional estimated outlier payments that exceed the current 8 percent outlier target since outlier payments are budget neutral. This would reduce payments to all LTCH cases, not just those that would receive a HCO payment based on the amount of the current fixed-loss threshold, which could result in inappropriately low payment amounts for typical LTCH cases (as shown by our analysis of payment-to-cost ratios when we developed the existing HCO policy when we implemented the LTCH PPS (67 FR 56022 through 56027)).

In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4799 through 4800) as an alternative to the proposal to raise the fixed-loss amount, we discussed adjusting the marginal cost factor (that is, the percentage that Medicare will pay of the estimated cost of a case that exceeds the sum of the adjusted Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount for LTCH PPS outlier cases as specified in § 412.525(a)(3)), which is currently equal to 80 percent, as a means of ensuring that estimated outlier payments would be projected to equal 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments. We explained that when we initially established the 80 percent marginal cost factor, our analysis of payment-to-cost ratios for HCO cases showed that a marginal cost factor of 80 percent appropriately addresses outlier cases that are significantly more expensive than nonoutlier cases, while simultaneously maintaining the integrity of the LTCH PPS (67 FR 56022 through 56027).

In that same proposed rule, we also discussed that although proposing to raise the fixed-loss amount from $14,887 to $18,774 would increase the amount of the ''loss'' that a LTCH must incur under the LTCH PPS for a case with unusually high costs before the LTCH would receive any additional Medicare payments, we continue to believe that the existing 8 percent outlier target and 80 percent marginal cost factor continue to adequately maintain the LTCHs' share of the financial risk in treating the most costly patients and ensure the efficient delivery of services. Accordingly, we did not propose to adjust the existing 8 percent outlier target or 80 percent marginal cost factor under the LTCH PPS HCO policy at this time. We also noted that the proposed fixed-loss amount of $18,774 is lower than the FY 2003 fixed-loss amount of $24,450 (67 FR 56023) and the 2004 LTCH PPS rate year fixed-loss amount of $19,590 (68 FR 34144), and only slightly higher than the 2005 LTCH PPS rate year fixed-loss amount of $17,864 (69 FR 25688), all of which were in effect during the time period that we estimate positive Medicare margins (as discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27820 through 27825)).

In conclusion, for the reasons discussed above in this section, we continue to believe a marginal cost factor of 80 percent and an outlier target of 8 percent best identifies LTCH patients that are truly unusually costly cases. Furthermore, we still believe that such a policy appropriately addresses LTCH HCO cases that are significantly more expensive than non-outlier cases, which is consistent with our intent of the LTCH HCO policy as stated when we implemented the LTCH PPS. Therefore, we are not making any changes to the marginal cost factor or outlier target in that final rule. Consequently, in order to maintain that estimated outlier payments are projected to be equal to 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments, as required under § 412.525(a), under the broad authority of section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we are establishing a fixed-loss amount of $22,954 based on the best available LTCH data and the policies presented in this final rule (as described in greater detail below). For the reasons discussed above, we believe a fixed-loss amount of $22,954 would appropriately identify unusually costly LTCH cases while maintaining the integrity of the LTCH PPS. We note that, as discussed in the RY 2008 proposed rule (72 FR 4800), we intend to revisit a budget neutral policy change in the outlier policy (among other things), which would affect future LTCH PPS payment rates, after the conclusion of the 5-year transition period when we expect to have several years of data generated after the implementation of the LTCH PPS.

In this final rule, as we proposed and consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available (as noted above), for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we used the December 2006 update of the FY 2006 MedPAR claims data to determine a fixed-loss amount that would result in estimated outlier payments projected to be equal to 8 percent of total estimated payments, based on the policies described in this final rule, because these data are the most recent complete LTCH data available. Furthermore, as noted previously, we determined the fixed-loss amount based on the version of the GROUPER that would be in effect as of the beginning of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007), that is, Version 24.0 of the GROUPER (as established in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47973)).

In addition, as we proposed and consistent with our historical practice of using the best data available (as noted above), we used CCRs from the December 2006 update of the PSF for determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as they are currently the most recent complete available data. As we discussed above in this section, we revised our methodology for our annual determination of the applicable LTCH CCR ceiling and applicable Statewide average CCRs in determining a LTCH's CCR effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006 in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117 through 48122). Accordingly, as proposed, in determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we used the current FY 2007 applicable LTCH ''total'' CCR ceiling of 1.321 and LTCH Statewide average ''total'' CCRs established under our revised methodology in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48118 and 48121) such that the current applicable Statewide average CCR would be assigned if, among other things, a LTCH's CCR exceeded the current ceiling (1.321). We note that in determining the fixed-loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year using the CCRs from the December 2006 update of the PSF, there was no need for us to independently assign the applicable Statewide average CCR to any LTCHs (as this may have already been done by the FI in the PSF in accordance with our established policy). (Currently, the applicable FY 2007 LTCH Statewide average CCRs can be found in Table 8C of the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48303).)

Accordingly, based on the data and policies described in this final rule, we are applying a fixed-loss amount of $22,954 for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Thus, we will pay an outlier case 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the case and the outlier threshold (the sum of the adjusted Federal LTCH payment for the LTC–DRG and the fixed-loss amount of $22,954). As discussed above, the fixed-

loss amount for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year is higher than the current fixed-loss amount of $14,887. In addition to being based on the most recent available LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case (as discussed in detail below in this section), this change in the fixed-loss amount is due to the projected decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that is expected to result from the revision to the SSO policy under § 412.529 (discussed in greater detail in section V.A.2. of this preamble), in conjunction with the changes to the area wage adjustment (discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.1. of this preamble) and the changes to the LTC–DRG relative weights for FY 2007 (as discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 47971 through 47994)). Specifically, as discussed in greater detail in the impact analysis presented in section XV.B.4. of this final rule, we are projecting that the changes presented in this final rule will result in an estimated 3.8 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge in RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007, on average, for all LTCHs. While we are projecting that the 0.71 percent update to the Federal rate (discussed in section IV.C. of this preamble) will result in an increase in estimated payments per discharge in RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007, this increase will be offset by the projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 of 0.9 percent due to the revision to the SSO policy and a projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 of 1.0 percent due to the changes to the area wage adjustment (including the progression of the established phase-in of that adjustment). We also project an estimated 2.5 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 due to the changes in the fixed-loss amount resulting from the use of more recent LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case.

We also note that the final fixed-loss amount for RY 2008 of $22,954 is higher than the proposed fixed-loss amount for RY 2008 of $18,778. This change in the fixed-loss amount is primarily due to the updated LTCH data (that is, LTCH claims data and CCR data) used in determining the fixed-loss amount. That is, to determine the proposed fixed-loss amount for RY 2008, we used claims data from the March 2006 update of the FY 2005 MedPAR file and CCRs from the July 2006 update of the PSF, as that was the best available data at that time.

However, to determine the fixed-loss amount for RY 2008 in this final rule, the most recent available data are the December 2006 update of the FY 2006 MedPAR claims data and the CCRs from the December 2006 update of the PSF. Our analysis of the data showed that, in general, the average cost per case has increased in the FY 2006 claim data as compared to the FY 2005 claims data, which if we had kept the fixed-loss amount at $18,778 would have caused the HCO target to exceed 8 percent. In fact, our analysis shows that if we were to keep the proposed fixed-loss amount of $18,774, we project that estimated outlier payments would be over 10 percent of total estimated LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. As discussed at length above, when we implemented the LTCH PPS, under the HCO policy we established the outlier target at 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments to allow us to achieve a balance between the need to protect hospitals with costly cases, while providing an incentive for hospitals to operate efficiently, and an outlier target in excess of 8 percent would not allow us to achieve this goal. In fact, our analysis shows that if we were to keep the proposed fixed-loss amount of $18,774, we project that estimated outlier payments would be over 10 percent of total estimated LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. As discussed at length above in this section, when we implemented the LTCH PPS, under the HCO policy we established the outlier target at 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments to allow us to achieve a balance between the need to protect hospitals with costly cases, while providing an incentive for hospitals to operate efficiently, and an outlier target in excess of 8 percent would not allow us to achieve this goal. Consequently, the fixed-loss amount is increased to maintain the HCO target at 8 percent. Furthermore, although in the past we have found LTCHs' CCRs have been relatively stable, in establishing the fixed-loss amount for RY 2008, we noticed that the CCRs used to estimate cost per case are more volatile in recent years. This causes us concern, and therefore, we intend to monitor LTCHs' CCRs in the future. As specified at § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(D), HCO payments are subject to the outlier reconciliation process described below in this section.

d. Reconciliation of Outlier Payments Upon Cost Report Settlement

In the June 9, 2003 HCO final rule (68 FR 34508 through 34512), we established our policy for LTCHs that provided that effective for LTCH PPS discharges occurring on or after August 8, 2003, any reconciliation of outlier payments will be based upon the actual CCR computed from the costs and charges incurred in the period during which the discharge occurs. In that same final rule, we also established that, for discharges occurring on or after August 8, 2003, at the time of any reconciliation, outlier payments may be adjusted to account for the time value of any underpayments or overpayments based upon a widely available index to be established in advance by the Secretary and will be applied from the midpoint of the cost reporting period to the date of reconciliation. (Additional information on the administration of the reconciliation process under the IPPS is provided in CMS Program Transmittal 707 (October 12, 2005; Change Request 3966). We note that we are currently developing additional instructions on the administration of the reconciliation process under the LTCH PPS that would be similar to the IPPS reconciliation process.)

In the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48121 through 48122), for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, we codified into the LTCH PPS section of the regulations (42 CFR part 412, subpart O) the provisions governing the determination of LTCHs' CCRs, including modifications and editorial clarifications to our existing methodology for determining the annual LTCH CCR ceiling and applicable Statewide average CCRs under the LTCH PPS. (We note that we also made the same changes under the SSO policy at § 412.529(c)(3), as discussed in section V.A.1.c. of this preamble).

In the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48122), under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we revised § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(D) through (E), for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, to codify in subpart O of 42 CFR part 412 the provisions discussed concerning the reconciliation of LTCH PPS outlier payments, including editorial clarifications discussed in greater detail in this section, that would more precisely describe the application of those policies. Specifically, at § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(D), we specified that for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, any reconciliation of outlier payments will be based on the CCR calculated based on a ratio of costs-to-charges computed from the relevant cost report and charge data determined at the time the cost report coinciding with the discharge is settled. In addition, at § 412.525(a)(4)(iv)(E), we specified that for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, at the time of any reconciliation, outlier payments may be adjusted to account for the time value of any underpayments or overpayments. We also specified that

such an adjustment will be based upon a widely available index to be established in advance by the Secretary and will be applied from the midpoint of the cost reporting period to the date of reconciliation. We made these additional revisions to § 412.525(a)(4) because we believe that these changes are more consistent with the LTCH PPS single payment rate for inpatient operating and capital costs (as discussed in greater detail previously), and because we believe it is more appropriate and administratively simpler to include all of the regulatory provisions concerning the determination of LTCH PPS outlier payments applicable under the LTCH PPS regulations in subpart O of 42 CFR part 412 of the CFR.

Comment: One commenter requested that we clarify how we interpret the 10 percentage point criterion of the SSO and HCO reconciliation policy.

Response: We did not propose any changes to the current reconciliation policy. Therefore, we do not believe this final rule is the appropriate vehicle to address this comment. As we have stated, we intend to issue subregulatory guidance on LTCH reconciliation that would be similar to the IPPS reconciliation process and would address the commenters question at that time.

e. Application of Outlier Policy to Short-Stay Outlier (SSO) Cases

As we discussed in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56026), under some rare circumstances, a LTCH discharge could qualify as a SSO case (as defined under § 412.529 and discussed in section V.A.1.a. of this preamble) and also as a HCO case. In this scenario, a patient could be hospitalized for less than five-sixths of the geometric ALOS for the specific LTC–DRG, and yet incur extraordinarily high treatment costs. If the costs exceeded the outlier threshold (that is, the SSO payment plus the fixed-loss amount), the discharge would be eligible for payment as a HCO. Thus, for a SSO case in the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, the HCO payment will be 80 percent of the difference between the estimated cost of the case and the outlier threshold (the sum of the fixed-loss amount of $22,954 and the amount paid under the SSO policy).

4. Other Payment Adjustments

As indicated earlier, we have broad authority under section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA to determine appropriate adjustments under the LTCH PPS, including whether (and how) to provide for adjustments to reflect variations in the necessary costs of treatment among LTCHs. Thus, in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56014 through 56027), we discussed our extensive data analysis and rationale for not implementing an adjustment for geographic reclassification, rural location, treating a disproportionate share of low-income patients (DSH), or indirect medical education (IME) costs. In that same final rule, we stated that we would collect data and reevaluate the appropriateness of these adjustments in the future once more LTCH data become available after the LTCH PPS is implemented.

As we discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27839), we now believe that after the completion of the 5-year transition, sufficient new data that will have been generated while LTCHs are subject to the LTCH PPS may be available for a comprehensive reevaluation of payment adjustments such as geographic reclassification, rural location, DSH, and IME. The end of the 5-year transition occurs with cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2007. Therefore, in the RY 2008 LTCH PPPS proposed rule (72 FR 4801), we did not propose to make any adjustments for geographic reclassification, rural location, DSH, or IME. However, we noted that we will continue to collect and interpret new data as they become available in the future to determine if these data support proposing any additional payment adjustments. We also reiterated our belief that it is appropriate to wait for the conclusion of the 5-year transition to 100 percent of the Federal rate under the LTCH PPS, to maximize the availability of data that are reflective of LTCH behavior in response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS to be used to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the potential payment adjustment policies (such as rural location, DSH and IME) in conjunction with our evaluation of the possibility of making a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates provided for at § 412.523(d)(3).

Therefore, in this final rule, we are not making any adjustments for geographic reclassification, rural location, DSH, or IME under the LTCH PPS for RY 2008. As noted above, we will continue to collect and interpret new data as they become available in the future to determine if these data support proposing any additional payment adjustments. We plan to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the potential payment adjustment policies (such as rural location, DSH and IME) in conjunction with our evaluation of the possibility of making a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates provided for at § 412.523(d)(3) after the conclusion of the 5-year transition to 100 percent of the Federal rate under the LTCH PPS.

5. Budget Neutrality (BN) Offset To Account for the Transition Methodology

Under § 412.533, we implemented a 5-year transition, during which a LTCH is paid a total LTCH PPS payment that is comprised of an increasing percentage of the LTCH PPS Federal prospective payment rate and a decreasing percentage of its payments based on the reasonable cost-based payment principles for each discharge. Furthermore, we allow a LTCH (other than those defined as ''new'' under § 412.23(e)(4)) to elect to be paid based on 100 percent of the standard Federal rate in lieu of the blended methodology.

The standard Federal rate was determined as if all LTCHs will be paid based on 100 percent of the standard Federal rate. As stated earlier, we provided for a 5-year transition period that allows LTCHs to receive LTCH PPS payments in which a component incorporates reasonable cost principles. To maintain BN for FY 2003 as required by section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA during the 5-year transition period, we reduce all LTCH Medicare payments (whether a LTCH elects payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate or whether a LTCH is being paid under the transition blend methodology) to account for the cost of the applicable transition period methodology in a given LTCH PPS rate year.

Specifically, during the LTCH PPS rate years governed under the 5-year transition policy at § 412.533(a), we reduce all LTCH Medicare payments during the 5-year transition by a factor that is equal to 1 minus the ratio of the estimated TEFRA reasonable cost-based payments that would be made if the LTCH PPS was not implemented, to the projected total Medicare program PPS payments (that is, payments made under the transition methodology and the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate).

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27841), based on the best available data at that time, we projected that approximately 98 percent of LTCHs will be paid based on 100 percent of the standard Federal rate rather than receive payment under the transition blend methodology for the 2006 LTCH PPS rate year. Using the same methodology described in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56034), this projection, which used updated data and inflation factors, was based on our

estimate that either: (1) A LTCH has already elected payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate prior to the start of the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2006); or (2) a LTCH would receive higher payments based on 100 percent of the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year standard Federal rate compared to the payments it would receive under the transition blend methodology. Similarly, we projected that the remaining 2 percent of LTCHs would choose to be paid based on the applicable transition blend methodology (as set forth under § 412.533(a)) because they would receive higher payments than if they were paid based on 100 percent of the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year standard Federal rate.

Also in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 24202), based on the best available data at that time and policy revisions described in that same rule, we projected that in absence of a transition BN offset, the full effect of the final full year of the transition period (including the election option) as compared to payments as if all LTCHs would be paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate would result in a negligible cost to the Medicare program (that is, less than $1 million in RY 2007). Because the $1 million in estimated costs to the Medicare program was such a small percentage of the estimated total LTCH payments for RY 2007 (over $5 billion), the formula that we use to establish the BN offset resulted in a factor, which we reduce all Medicare payments by to account for the additional costs of the transition methodology of zero (due to rounding). Therefore, we established a zero percent transition period BN offset to all LTCH PPS payments for discharge occurring on or after July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, to account for the estimated cost of the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate) in RY 2007. Furthermore, in that same final rule (71 FR 27841), we explained that we are no longer projecting a small cost for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) even though some LTCHs will have a cost reporting period for the 5th year of the transition period which will be concluding in the first 3 months of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. This is because, based on the most available data, we are projecting that the vast majority of LTCHs would have made the election to be paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate rather than the transition blend which would result in a negligible cost to the Medicare program. In fact, as discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4802), based on the most recent available data at that time from the July 2006 update of the PSF, we continue to estimate that nearly all (over 98 percent) LTCHs are currently being paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate (rather than the transition blend methodology). Even for those few remaining LTCHs paid under the transition blend methodology set forth at § 412.533(a), the majority of their LTCH PPS payments are now based on at least 80 percent of the Federal rate and 20 percent of the reasonable cost amount (for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2006) since there are no longer any LTCHs in their cost reporting periods that began during FY 2003 through FY 2005 (the first three years of the 5-year transition period). Therefore, in that same proposed rule, we explained that we continue to believe that there would be no measurable estimated cost to the Medicare program due to the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate) in RY 2008. Accordingly, we did not propose a transition BN offset to all LTCH PPS payments for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, to account for the estimated cost of the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, since some LTCHs may still be paid under the 4th year of the transition blend methodology, specified at § 412.533, for the first 3 months of RY 2008) in RY 2008.

We received no comments on this proposal, and based on the most recent available data from the December 2006 update of the PSF, we continue to estimate that nearly all (over 98 percent) LTCHs are currently being paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate (rather than the transition blend methodology). Therefore, we continue to believe that there would be no measurable estimated cost to the Medicare program due to the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate) in RY 2008. Accordingly, in this final rule, based on updated data and using the same methodology established in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56034), we are not implementing a transition BN offset to all LTCH PPS payments for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008, to account for the estimated cost of the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, since some LTCHs may still be paid under the 4th year of the transition blend methodology, specified at § 412.533, for the first 3 months of RY 2008) in RY 2008.

6. One-Time Prospective Adjustment to the Standard Federal Rate.

As we discussed in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56036), consistent with the statutory requirement for BN in section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA, we estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS for FY 2003 to be equal to the estimated aggregate payments that would be made if the LTCH PPS were not implemented. Our methodology for estimating payments for purposes of the BN calculations used the best available data at the time and necessarily reflected assumptions. As the LTCH PPS progresses, we are monitoring payment data and will evaluate the ultimate accuracy of the assumptions used in the BN calculations (for example, inflation factors, intensity of services provided, or behavioral response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS) described in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56027 through 56037). To the extent these assumptions significantly differ from actual experience, the aggregate amount of actual payments may turn out to be significantly higher or lower than the estimates on which the BN calculations were based.

Section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of BIPA provides broad authority to the Secretary in developing the LTCH PPS, including the authority for establishing appropriate adjustments. Under this broad authority to make appropriate adjustments, as implemented in the existing § 412.523(d)(3) (as revised in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule), we have provided for the possibility of making a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates by July 1, 2008, so that the effect of any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments for the first year of the LTCH PPS would not be perpetuated in the LTCH PPS rates for future years.

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27842), based on the best available data at that time, we estimated that total Medicare program payments for LTCH services over the next 5 LTCH PPS rate years would be $5.27 billion for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year; $5.43 billion for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year; $5.63 billion for the 2009 LTCH PPS rate year; $5.86 billion for the 2010 LTCH PPS rate year; and $6.13 billion

for the 2011 LTCH PPS rate year. In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4802 through 4803), based on the best available data at that time, we estimated that total Medicare program payments for LTCH services over the next 5 LTCH PPS rate years would be $4.65 billion for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year; $4.84 billion for the 2009 LTCH PPS rate year; $5.02 billion for the 2010 LTCH PPS rate year; $5.24 billion for the 2011 LTCH PPS rate year; and $5.48 billion for the 2012 LTCH PPS rate year.

In this final rule, consistent with the methodology established in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56036), based on the most recent available data, we estimate that total Medicare program payments for LTCH services for the next 5 LTCH PPS rate years would be as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

LTCH PPS rate year	Estimated payments ($ in billions)
2008	$4.65
2009	4.85
2010	5.04
2011	5.25
2012	5.50

In accordance with the methodology established in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56037), these estimates are based on the most recent available data, including the projection that nearly all LTCHs will be paid based on 100 percent of the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate during the majority of RY 2008 (in accordance with the transition blend percentages set forth at § 412.533(a)). These estimates are also based on our estimate of LTCH PPS rate year payments to LTCHs using CMS's Office of the Actuary's (OACT) most recent estimate of the RPL market basket of 3.2 percent for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, 3.2 percent for the 2009 LTCH PPS rate year, 2.8 percent for the 2010 LTCH PPS rate year, 3.1 percent for the 2011 LTCH PPS rate year, and 3.2 percent for the 2012 LTCH PPS rate year. (We note that OACT develops its spending projections based on existing policy. Therefore, changes that have not yet been implemented are not reflected in the spending projections shown in this section.) We also considered OACT's most recent projections of changes in Medicare beneficiary enrollment that estimate a change in Medicare fee-for-service beneficiary enrollment of −0.1 percent in the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, 0.7 percent in the 2009 LTCH PPS rate year, 0.3 percent in the 2010 LTCH PPS rate year, 0.6 percent in the 2011 LTCH PPS rate year, and 1.1 percent in the 2012 LTCH PPS rate year.

In the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule implementing the LTCH PPS (67 FR 55954), we set forth the implementing regulations, based upon the broad authority granted to the Secretary, under section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA. Section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA required that the system ''maintain budget neutrality'' for FY 2003, that is, that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS would be projected to be equal to the estimated aggregate payments that would be made if the LTCH PPS would not be implemented for FY 2003. The methodology for determining the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate for FY 2003 that would ''maintain budget neutrality'' is described in considerable detail in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56027 through 56037). As we discussed in that same final rule, our methodology for estimating payments for the purposes of BN calculations used the best available data and necessarily reflects assumptions in estimating aggregate payments that would be made if the LTCH PPS was not implemented. We also stated our intentions to monitor LTCH PPS payment data to evaluate the ultimate accuracy of the assumptions used in the BN calculations (for example, inflation factors, intensity of services provided, or behavioral response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS). To the extent that those assumptions significantly differ from actual experience, the estimated aggregate amount of actual payments during FY 2003 may result in significantly higher or lower estimated payments than the estimates upon which the BN calculations were based. In that same final rule, the Secretary exercised his broad authority in establishing the LTCH PPS and provided for the possibility of a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates by October 1, 2006, in § 412.523(d)(3) (this deadline was revised to July 1, 2008, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule). The purpose of that provision was to prevent any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments for the 1st year of the LTCH PPS, when we established the budget neutral Federal rate as required by the statute (discussed previously), from being perpetuated in the PPS rates for future years.

As we discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27842 through 27844), because the LTCH PPS was only recently implemented, sufficient new data had not been generated that would enable us to conduct a comprehensive reevaluation of our BN calculations. Therefore, in that same final rule, we did not implement a one-time adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3) so that the effect of any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments for the 1st year of the LTCH PPS would not be perpetuated in the PPS rates for future years. However, we stated that we will continue to collect and interpret new data as it becomes available in the future to determine if this adjustment should be proposed. Therefore, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27842), we revised § 412.523(d)(3) by changing the original October 1, 2006 deadline (established in the August 30, 2002 final rule that implemented the LTCH PPS) to July 1, 2008, to postpone the requirement due to the time lag in the availability of Medicare data upon which this adjustment would be based.

As we discussed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27843 through 27844), we now believe that after the conclusion of the 5-year transition period, sufficient new data will be generated by the LTCH PPS for a comprehensive reevaluation of our FY 2003 BN calculations. Specifically, we explained that the final year of the 5-year transition to LTCH PPS payments based on 100 percent of the Federal rate for all LTCHs will begin for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006 (FY 2007), and end with cost reporting periods beginning before October 1, 2007 (FY 2008). After the conclusion of the 5-year transition period (October 1, 2007), we expect to have between 3 and 4 years (FY 2003 through FY 2006) of LTCH data generated since the implementation of the LTCH PPS. We note that there is a lag time between the submission of claims data and cost report data, and the availability of that data in the MedPAR files and HCRIS, respectively. Based on a comprehensive analysis of that data, we may then propose to make a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates as provided for in § 412.523(d)(3). As also explained in that same final rule, we believe that postponing the deadline of the possible one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates provided for in § 412.523(d)(3) to July 1, 2008, would result in the availability of additional data generated under the LTCH PPS and, therefore, our decisions regarding a possible adjustment would be based on more complete and up-to-date data. This data would be reflective of LTCH behavior in response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS.

Evaluating the appropriateness of the possible one-time prospective

adjustment will entail a thorough review of the actual Medicare costs incurred by LTCHs during the first year of the LTCH PPS, that is, for LTCH cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2003. When we established the FY 2003 standard Federal rate to be budget neutral, we used the most recent LTCH cost data available at that time, and trended that data forward to estimate what Medicare would have paid to LTCHs under the TEFRA payment system if the PPS were not implemented (67 FR 56033). Our methodology for estimating payments for the purposes of BN calculations, utilized the best available data and necessarily reflected assumptions in estimating aggregate payments that would have been made had the LTCH PPS not been implemented. (The methodology for determining the LTCH PPS standard Federal rate for FY 2003 that would ''maintain budget neutrality'' is described in considerable detail in the August 30, 2002 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 56027 through 56037).) In that same final rule (67 FR 56036), we also stated our intentions to monitor LTCH PPS data to evaluate the ultimate accuracy of the assumptions used in the BN calculations (for example, inflation factors, intensity of services provided, or behavioral response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS). To the extent that those assumptions significantly differed from actual experience, the aggregate amount of actual payments during FY 2003 could be significantly higher or lower than the estimates upon which the BN calculations were based.

At the outset of the LTCH PPS, we provided for the possibility of a one-time prospective adjustment at § 412.523(d)(3). Among other things, we wanted the opportunity to adjust the LTCH PPS Federal payment rate once data were available that reflected the actual cost-based payments that would have been made under the Medicare program during FY 2003 if the LTCH PPS had not been implemented, rather than perpetuate any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments in the 1st year of the LTCH PPS used in determining the Federal rate into future years. Therefore, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we revised § 412.523(d)(3) to postpone the adjustment until July 1, 2008, because by that time, given the lag time typically involved in the entire cost report settlement procedure, we believe we will be able to utilize the most accurate data reflecting the actual costs incurred by LTCHs for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003.

As we discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4804), we continue to believe that collecting and evaluating new data as it becomes available will allow us to have the best data from the first year of the LTCH PPS upon which to base an adjustment such as this. As we explained in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27844), there are many LTCHs with cost reporting periods from September 1 through August 30 which first became subject to the LTCH PPS on September 1, 2003. Given the lag time required for typical cost report settlement involving submission, desk review, and in some cases an audit, which can take approximately 2 additional years to complete (and we expect to audit a number of LTCH cost reports for the purpose of this analysis), we explained that the October 1, 2006 deadline established § 412.523(d)(3) was no longer reasonable or realistic. In fact, we believe that for cost reports for providers on August 2004 fiscal year ending date, we would be in possession of the most reliable cost report data, indicating the actual costs of the Medicare program of the LTCH PPS during the year in which we established the Federal payment rate by July 2007. Any proposed adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3), if finalized could then be implemented on July 1, 2008. Therefore, in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we did not propose to make a one-time adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3) since we believe that we still do not have sufficient new data to enable us to conduct a comprehensive reevaluation of our FY 2003 BN calculations (as discussed in greater detail above in this section).

Comment: We received a few comments in support of waiting another year (that is, until RY 2009) to make the one-time BN adjustment to benefit from the availability of better data. However, some other commenters noted that considering all of the payment adjustments we have made to the LTCH PPS since it was implemented on October 1, 2002, there is no need for a one-time BN adjustment to ensure that aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS would equal approximately the amount that would have been paid to LTCHs under TEFRA had the LTCH PPS not been implemented.

Response: We agree with the commenters that any one-time adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3) should be based on the most complete and up-to-date data available for a comprehensive analysis of the actual Medicare costs incurred by LTCHs during the first year of the LTCH PPS. As discussed in greater detail above, given the lag time required for typical cost report settlement and the lag time in data availability, after the conclusion of the 5-year transition period (October 1, 2007), we expect to have between 3 and 4 years (FY 2003 through FY 2006) of LTCH data generated since the implementation of the LTCH PPS. Specifically, we expect that we will be in possession of the most reliable cost report data, indicating the actual costs of the Medicare program of the LTCH PPS during the year in which we established the standard Federal base payment rate by July 2007, and any proposed adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3), if finalized could then be implemented on July 1, 2008.

We recognize that there have been many changes to the payment rates and policies under the LTCH PPS since its implementation over 5 years ago. Many of these changes have been implemented as a result of our on-going monitoring of LTCH data and changes in LTCHs' behavior in response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS. As discussed above, the purpose of the one-time adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3) is to prevent any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments from the first year of the LTCH PPS, when we established the budget neutral Federal rate as required by the statute, from being perpetuated in the PPS rates for future years. As discussed above, our methodology for estimating payments for the purposes of BN calculations when the LTCH PPS was implemented used the best available data and necessarily reflects assumptions in estimating aggregate payments that would be made if the LTCH PPS was not implemented. To the extent that those assumptions significantly differ from actual experience, the aggregate amount of actual payments may result in significantly higher or lower payments than the estimates upon which the BN calculations were based. Therefore, we established in regulations at § 412.523(d)(3) the possibility of a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates to prevent any significant difference between actual payments and estimated payments from being perpetuated in the LTCH PPS rates for future years (as described in greater detail above in this section). Among the changes that have been made to the LTCH PPS since its implementation include updates to the standard Federal rate as set forth under § 412.523(c)(3). We note that we will take into consideration such changes

when we evaluate the most recent complete available data for the purposes of determining whether to propose a one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates under § 412.523(d)(3) in the RY 2009 proposed rule.

For the reasons discussed in this section, we believe that we still do not have sufficient new data to enable us to conduct a comprehensive reevaluation of our FY 2003 BN calculations. Accordingly, in this final rule, we are not making a one-time adjustment under § 412.523(d)(3) at this time.

V. Other Policy Changes for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

A. Short Stay Outlier (SSO) Cases

1. Background

In the Prospective Payment System for LTCHs: Implementation and FY 2003 Rates final rule (67 FR 55954, August 30, 2002) (hereinafter referred to as the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule), under § 412.529, we established a special payment policy for SSO cases, that is cases with a covered LOS that is less than or equal to five-sixths of the geometric average LOS for each LTC–DRG. When we established the SSO policy, we explained in the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule that ''[a] short-stay outlier case may occur when a beneficiary receives less than the full course of treatment at the LTCH before being discharged.'' (67 FR 55995) Also in the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule, we stated that when we first described the policy, in the Prospective Payment System for LTCHs: Implementation and FY 2003 Rates proposed rule (67 FR 55995, March 27, 2002), ''* * * we based the proposed policy on the belief that many of these patients could have been treated more appropriately in an acute hospital subject to the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system''. Therefore, under the LTCH PPS, we implemented a special payment adjustment for SSO cases. Under the original SSO policy, for LTCH PPS discharges with a covered LOS of up to and including five-sixths the geometric average LOS for the LTC–DRG, we adjusted the per discharge payment under the LTCH PPS by the least of 120 percent of the estimated cost of the case, 120 percent of the LTC–DRG specific per diem amount multiplied by the covered LOS of that discharge, or the full LTC–DRG payment 67 FR 55995 through 56000).

As noted previously, generally LTCHs are defined by statute as having an ALOS of greater than 25 days. We stated that we believed that the SSO payment adjustment results in more appropriate payments, since these cases most likely did not receive a full course of a LTCH-level of treatment in such a short period of time and the full LTC–DRG payment would generally not be appropriate. Payment-to-cost ratio analyses indicated that if LTCHs received a full LTC–DRG payment for those cases, they would have been significantly ''overpaid'' for the resources they have actually expended in treating those patients (67 FR 55995 through 56000).

Furthermore, in establishing the SSO policy, we stated that we believed that providing a reduced payment for SSO cases would discourage hospitals from admitting these patients. We also believed that the policy did not severely penalize providers that, in good faith, had admitted a patient and provided some services before realizing that the beneficiary could receive more appropriate treatment at another site of care. As we explained in the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule, establishing a SSO payment for these types of cases addresses the incentives inherent in a discharge-based PPS for LTCHs for treating patients with a short LOS (67 FR 55995 through 56000).

2. Additional Discussion of the SSO Payment Formula

In the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule, when we first presented our rationale for establishing the SSO policy, we had proposed an adjustment to ensure appropriate payment for cases that we believed may have been transferred from an acute hospital prematurely. Even if a patient was an appropriate admission to the LTCH, we also believed that a short stay case at a LTCH most likely did not receive a full course of medical treatment during the short stay and that a full LTC–DRG payment would therefore, be inappropriate (67 FR 55995 through 56000).

In keeping with these concerns, and based on an evaluation of data from more than 3 years of the LTCH PPS, which revealed that a large percentage of SSOs had a covered LOS of 14 days or less, we revised our payment policy for SSO cases in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule for subclause (I) LTCHs (71 FR 27845 through 27870).

Consistent with the Secretary's broad authority ''to provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term hospital payment system * * *'' established under section 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, for RY 2007, we reduced the cost-based option of the SSO policy adjustment to 100 percent of the estimated costs of the case for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2006. We believed that by reducing the Medicare payment to a LTCH for a specific SSO case so that it would not exceed the estimated costs incurred for that case, we would be removing what we believed could be a financial incentive to admit and treat SSO cases that the then existing policy had established for LTCHs. We did not change the payment option of 120 percent of the per diem for a specific LTC–DRG multiplied by the covered LOS for that case because as described in detail in the FY 2003 final rule LTCH PPS, when we first established the SSO policy, we found that by adjusting the per discharge payment by paying at 120 percent of the per diem LTC–DRG payment, once a stay reaches five-sixths of the geometric average LOS for the LTC–DRG, the full LTC–DRG payment will have been made (67 FR 55999). We continue to believe that this specific methodology, which results in a gradual increase in payment as the LOS increases without producing a significant payment ''cliff'' at any one point, provides a reasonable payment option under the SSO policy.

However, an analysis of the FY 2004 MedPAR data indicated that even under the existing SSO policy, LTCHs were admitting short stay patients that we believe could have continued treatment at the acute care hospitals (paid for under the IPPS) but could have been actually being prematurely discharged to LTCHs. Therefore, in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we added a fourth payment option. This fourth payment alternative, a blend of an LTCH PPS amount that is comparable to the IPPS per diem payment amount, and 120 percent of the LTC–DRG per diem payment amount, as described below in this section, reflects our belief that as the length of a SSO stay increases, the case begins to resemble a more ''typical'' LTCH stay and, therefore, it is appropriate that incrementally, payment should be based more on what would otherwise be payable under the LTCH PPS and less on the IPPS-comparable amount. (Specifics of calculating the IPPS-comparable amount are set forth in considerable detail in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27852 through 27853).

We noted at the outset of the LTCH PPS for FY 2003, that the LTCH standard rate was calibrated based on LTCH resources expended in treating a patient population requiring long stays. Therefore, in establishing the SSO policy at the beginning of the LTCH PPS, we determined that it was appropriate that we not pay a full LTC–DRG payment for a patient stay not requiring those resources (67 FR 55995 through 56000). Our revision of the payment formula for SSOs for RY 2007 reflected our belief that where a case

met our definition of a SSO at § 412.529(a), as the covered LOS increased, the case began to more closely resemble a characteristic LTCH case (and less like a short term acute care hospital case). Therefore, it was appropriate to base an increasing percentage of payment for SSOs on the LTC–DRG payment amount and a decreasing percentage of the LTCH PPS payment amount based upon the IPPS-comparable amount.

We continue to believe that in defining a LTCH as a hospital with an inpatient ALOS of greater than 25 days in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act, that the Congress was focusing on LOS as the essential characteristic of this provider category. Furthermore, we believe that the statutory change requiring the establishment of the LTCH PPS emphasized that the payment system should reflect the different resource use related to inpatient hospital services provided by hospitals specified by section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv) of the Act, that is, by LTCHs (71 FR 27865). Specifically, we believe that the language of the statute indicates that the Congress believed that LTCHs *treat* or should be treating patients with different medical needs which results in those patients having a significantly longer LOS than those acute care hospital patients that we pay for under the IPPS.

In section 4422 of the BBA of 1997, which required that the Secretary develop a legislative proposal for the establishment of a PPS for LTCHs, the Congress specified that the system ''shall include an adequate patient classification system that reflects the differences in patient resource use and costs among such hospitals.'' Section 123 of the BBRA of 1999, which required implementation of a PPS for LTCHs for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, specified, among other things, that the system be a per discharge payment system, based on diagnosis-related groups (DRGs), and ''reflects the differences in patient resource use and costs'' of LTCH patients. Section 307(b) of the BIPA of 2000 required the Secretary ''to examine the feasibility and the impact of basing payment under such a system on the use of existing (or refined) hospital DRGs that have been modified to account for different resource use of LTCH patients.''

When we developed the LTCH PPS for FY 2003, the most recently available MedPAR data (generally, for FYs 1998 and 1999) revealed that 52 percent of the Medicare patients at LTCHs nationwide had a LOS of less than two-thirds of the ALOS for the LTC–DRG to which they were grouped. Of these cases, 20 percent had stays of less than 8 days. Since payments under the LTCH PPS were based on the resources necessary for treatment requiring long term hospital-level stays, beginning with the start of the LTCH PPS, we established the SSO policy, to provide appropriate payment for stays that were significantly shorter than the ALOS for each specific LTC–DRG.

The original SSO policy focused on our concerns that a SSO patient would generally receive less than the full course of treatment at the LTCH before being discharged and a full LTC–DRG payment would not be appropriate (67 FR 55943, 55995 through 55996). As we noted in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, when we revised the SSO policy based on our analysis of the nearly 3 years of data since we designed the LTCH PPS, we believed that our SSO policy should reflect our conviction that many SSO patients could otherwise have continued to receive appropriate care in the acute care hospital from which they were admitted. Had these patients not been discharged from the acute care hospital, the additional days of treatment would have continued to have been paid for under the IPPS (71 FR 27845 through 27865).

Section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA, confers broad authority on the Secretary to implement a PPS for LTCHs, including provisions for appropriate adjustments to the payment system. This broad authority gives the Secretary flexibility to fashion a LTCH PPS based on both original policies, as well as concepts borrowed from other payment systems that are adapted, where appropriate to the LTCH context. In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we formulated a payment adjustment under the LTCH PPS that we believed would result in an appropriate payment adjustment for those inpatient stays that we believe are not characteristic of LTCHs but could more appropriately be treated in another setting.

Subsequent to the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we have performed additional analysis of more recent data FY 2005 MedPAR data, and have determined that 42 percent of LTCH SSO discharges, or approximately 19,750 cases, had lengths of stay that were less than or equal to the average LOS plus one standard deviation of an IPPS discharge that is the same DRG as the LTC–DRG to which the case was assigned. (One standard deviation is a statistical test which measures the certainty of the average of a set of measurements for the purpose of data analysis. The standard deviation is the quantity commonly used by statisticians to measure the variation in a data set.) We believe that it is appropriate to compare the covered LOS of a LTCH case grouped to a particular LTC–DRG to the ALOS plus one standard deviation for the corresponding DRG under the IPPS. At one standard deviation, we have identified approximately 68 percent of the IPPS cases within that DRG that were discharged from acute care hospitals and paid for under the IPPS. Using the statistical test of one standard deviation of the ALOS for each DRG under the IPPS, identifies the majority of IPPS discharges in any DRG.

We believe that the 42 percent of LTCH SSO cases in the RY 2005 MedPAR files with lengths of stay that are equal to or less than the IPPS ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRGs under the IPPS appear to be comparable to typical stays at acute care hospitals.

Although LTCHs are certified by Medicare as acute care hospitals, we believe that the Congress intended for the higher LTCH PPS payments to be made to LTCHs that treat patients requiring prolonged hospital-level care. Payments under the LTCH PPS, in compliance with the statutory mandates, have been calibrated based on ''the different resource use'' of LTCHs. We believe that we are ''overpaying,'' under the LTCH PPS, for those SSO cases in LTCHs with covered lengths of stay that are equal to or less than the typical IPPS ALOS (that is, a LOS that is less than or equal to the average IPPS LOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG under the IPPS).

We further believe that in excluding LTCHs from being paid under the IPPS, the Congress also recognized several types of hospital-level providers that offered a different type of treatment than could reasonably be paid for under the IPPS. Specifically, in the FY 2002 LTCH PPS final rule, we reviewed the history of LTCHs as hospitals excluded from the IPPS. At that time we quoted the legislative history of the 1983 Social Security Amendments which stated, with regard to LTCHs, that the ''DRG system was developed for short-term acute care general hospitals and as currently constructed does not adequately account for special circumstances of diagnoses requiring long stays'' (Report of the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, to Accompany HR 1900, H.R. Rept. No. 98025, at 141 (1983) (67 FR 55957)). Therefore, from the very outset of the IPPS, the Congress distinguished LTCHs from short term acute care hospitals by patients' lengths

of stay. The PPS for LTCHs that we implemented in FY 2003, complied with the statutory mandate, cited above in this section, that payments under the LTCH PPS be calibrated based on ''the different resource use'' of these long-stay LTCH patients. Consequently, as we stated in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we believe that ''LTCHs that admit SSO patients with lengths of stay more typical of an acute care hospital may be, in fact, behaving like acute care hospitals'' (71 FR 27847), and we also believe that it is reasonable for payments under the LTCH PPS for such cases to reflect this behavior.

MedPAR data indicate that for the approximately 350 LTCHs in existence during FY 2005 that discharged approximately 130,000 cases, 46,600 discharges were SSO patients. During that same period, the approximately 3,600 acute care hospitals throughout the United States discharged approximately 12.7 million Medicare beneficiaries. At the approximately 3,600 acute care hospitals, treatment for Medicare patients is paid for under the IPPS, including those cases with a LOS that is the same as the LOS for SSO treated at a LTCH. However at a LTCH, even under the blend payment option of the SSO policy that we established for RY 2007, a percentage of the payment for those short stay patients at LTCHs may be based on a payment rate that was calculated to reflect the ''different resource use'' at LTCHs as compared to payment based on DRGs at acute care hospitals paid for under the IPPS. We believe that based on this analysis under the existing SSO policy for short stay patients where the patient's LOS is less than or equal to the average LOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG at an acute care hospital, paid for under the IPPS, our blended payment methodology could result in an excessive payment.

Our data further indicates that typically LTCHs admit approximately 80 percent of their patients from acute care hospitals where their urgent conditions have been diagnosed, treated, and stabilized. We believe that when these patients are admitted to a LTCH for an extremely short stay, the LTCH appears to be serving as a step-down unit of the acute care hospital (71 FR 27857 through 27858). (Section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act, provides for the establishment of rehabilitation and psychiatric units of section 1886(d) hospitals (that is, acute care hospitals paid for under the IPPS) but not LTCH units.)

As we stated in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, ''* * * an analysis of the CY 2004 MedPAR files revealed that for specified DRGs for acute care cases following ICU/CCU days, there were significantly fewer 'recuperative' days (nearly 50 percent) for acute care outlier patients that were discharged from the acute care hospital and then admitted to a LTCH than for those patients that were discharged from the acute care hospital and not subsequently admitted to a LTCH. For example, under the IPPS for DRG 475 (Respiratory system diagnosis with ventilator support) and DRG 483 (Trach with mechanical vent 96+ hours or PDX except face, mouth and neck diagnosis), the number of 'recuperative' days were considerably shorter at the acute care hospital if there was a discharge at the acute care hospital followed by an admission to a LTCH.'' (71 FR 27857) The data in Table 5 is consistent with our belief that many LTCHs appear to be admitting some SSO patients that could have received the care at the acute care hospital.

TABLE 5.—HCO LOS, ICU/CCU LOS, AND POST-ICU/CCU LOS FOR SELECTED INPATIENT DRGS BY POST-DISCHARGE STATUS

[Live discharges only]

DRG	Cases	LOS	Outlier ICU/CCU days	Post ICU/ CCU days
475 (no LTCH)	3,887	32.5	20.5	12
475 (with LTCH)	515	29.6	22.6	7
483 (no LTCH)	3,257	73.6	53.6	20
483 (with LTCH)	2,353	45.7	41	4.7

In our analysis of what we believe are excessive payments under the existing LTCH PPS for the shortest SSOs, we focused on those SSO cases where a LTCH patient's covered LOS at the LTCH is less than or equal to the ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG at acute care hospitals (the ''IPPS comparable threshold'') and distinguishing between those SSO cases with lengths of stay that are less than or equal to the ''IPPS comparable threshold'' from those that exceed that threshold.

For the purposes of this discussion, whether the LTCH SSO case is within the ''IPPS comparable threshold'' is determined by comparing the covered LOS of that SSO case which has been assigned to a particular LTC–DRG to the ALOS for the same DRG under the IPPS. For example, if the covered LOS of the LTCH SSO case is equal to or less than the average LOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG under the IPPS, the LTCH SSO case would be within the ''IPPS comparable threshold.'' In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we stated that an alternative payment option would be appropriate for such a case. We indicated that we were considering the following approach: in cases where the covered LOS was equal to or less than the ''IPPS comparable threshold'' (defined above in this section) of the same DRG under the IPPS, the SSO payment methodology could be revised so that payment would be based upon the least of 100 percent of estimated costs of the case as determined under § 412.529(d)(2); 120 percent of the LTC–DRG per diem multiplied by the covered LOS of the case as determined under § 412.529(d)(1); the Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG as determined under § 412.529(d)(3); or an LTCH PPS amount comparable to the IPPS per diem amount as defined at § 412.529(d)(4), not to exceed the full IPPS comparable amount.

We noted that the RTI Report discussed in Section XI. of the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4818) included an RTI recommendation that ''* * * for LTCH cases whose LOS is within 1 standard deviation of the IPPS average LOS, LTCHs should be paid the IPPS rate. When this occurs, it suggests that LTCH is providing general acute care for these patients. This will allow LTCHs to treat these cases but be paid on an equitable basis with other acute hospitals since the shorter length stay would suggest general acute treatment is being provided.'' (Recommendation 11, p. 139) (We also included the Executive Summary of the RTI Report as

Addendum B in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4884).)

Under the approach that we discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, SSO cases with covered lengths of stay exceeding the ''IPPS comparable threshold'' would continue to be paid under the existing SSO payment policy at § 412.529(c)(2) which is the least of: 100 percent of the estimate cost of the case as determined under § 412.529 (d)(2); 120 percent of the per diem of the LTC–DRG multiplied by the covered LOS of the case as determined under § 412.529(d)(1); the Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG as determined under § 412.529(d)(3); or a blend of the 120 percent of the LTC–DRG specific per diem amount and an amount comparable to the IPPS per diem amount as set forth in § 412.529 (c)(2)(iv). (The methodology for the calculation of these amounts is specified at § 412.529(d).)

However, for the shortest SSO cases (that is, if the LTCH patient's covered LOS is less than or equal to the ''IPPS-comparable threshold''), the IPPS comparable per diem amount, capped at the full IPPS comparable amount that is used under the blend option of the current SSO policy, could be the fourth payment option in the SSO payment formula, replacing the blend option in the adjusted LTCH PPS payment formula at existing § 412.529(c)(2)(iv). We indicated that we believed this approach to be appropriate because it would continue to ensure that the LTCH PPS payments are appropriate for all cases; including those with a LOS that resemble cases typically treated at acute care hospitals.

However, we also indicated that, in considering this policy direction, we did not believe that this approach for SSOs would be appropriate for the specific situation of a subsection (II) LTCH (that is, a LTCH meeting the definition specified in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act). We have addressed the uniqueness of this type of LTCH in several notices ((62 FR 45966, 46016, and 46026), (67 FR 55954 and 55974), (68 FR 34147 through 34148) (71 FR 27863)). We believe that subclause (II) LTCHs operate under a unique Congressional mandate which, as set forth in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act, circumscribes such a LTCHs' admission policies to the extent that it is being identified as a LTCH in order to provide a particular type of service (for which the ALOS is greater than 20 days) to a particular population (at least 80 percent have a principal diagnosis of neoplastic disease) (68 FR 34147). Therefore, in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4807), we indicated that exempting subsection (II) LTCHs under this approach is consistent with positions regarding the application of SSO policies to subclause (II) LTCHs. For example, in RY 2004, we provided a distinctive phase-in formula for subclause (II) LTCHs (§ 412.529(e)), and in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we did not apply SSO policy revisions for subclause (I) LTCHs (§ 412.529(c)(2)) to subclause (II) LTCHs ((68 FR 34122, 34147 through 34148) (71 FR 27798, 27863)).

To encourage a thorough and accurate evaluation of this approach, we included a column in Table 3 of Addendum A of the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4872 through 4884), which set forth the IPPS-comparable threshold for each LTC–DRG. We noted that to determine the ''IPPS Comparable Threshold'' for some DRGs it was sometimes necessary to supplement IPPS hospital statistical data due to a low volume of IPPS cases grouped to those DRGs. In addition, although IPPS hospital statistical data for the six transplant DRGs (103, 302, 480, 495, 512 and 513) and two error DRGs (469 and 470) may be available, we noted that we could assign a value of zero for the ''IPPS Comparable Threshold'' for these LTC–DRGs. This approach was consistent with our on-going policy under the LTCH PPS to assign a value of 0.0000 to the relative weights for these LTC–DRGs, as discussed in section III.D of this final rule.

As we detailed in this discussion, we are concerned as to whether it is appropriate to pay cases that have a covered LOS in the LTCH that is less than or equal to the IPPS ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG more than would be paid under the IPPS for a similar case. In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we solicited comments on the approach described above, as well as suggestions as to alternative ways in which to address our concerns.

We received many comments on the possible revision to the SSO policy that we discussed in the proposed rule. The commenters expressed the views of trade associations representing LTCHs, both for-profit and not-for-profit LTCH groups, medical corporations that include LTCHs, State medical societies, a Chamber of Commerce, legislators, physicians and other hospital staff, and several interested citizens. In general, commenters did not support the policy approach that we discussed and the payment effects that would result for LTCHs if the policy were adopted.

Comment: A number of commenters stated that the IPPS-comparable option that we discussed for payment under the SSO policy would be a violation of the express will of the Congress in establishing the category of hospitals that were excluded from the IPPS under section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act. In addition, these commenters stated that under that provision the Congress acknowledged that these excluded hospitals (that is, LTCHs, IRFs, IPFs, childrens hospitals, and cancer hospitals) could not reasonably be paid under a PPS system that had been designed to pay for treatment in acute care hospitals. Further, these commenters stated that the approach we discussed would violate the intent of the Congress (that is, as expressed in the BBRA of 1999 and the BIPA of 2000) to establish a unique PPS that is specific to LTCHs.

Some of these commenters claimed that the proposed IPPS-comparable option to the SSO payment policy would be forbidden under the statute because such a payment option would ignore the ''differences in patient resource use and cost'' at LTCHs. Some commenters criticized our use of the phrase ''a payment otherwise comparable to what would have been paid under the IPPS'' as a disingenuous attempt to ''side-step'' the Congressional mandate that the LTCHs not be paid based on the acute care IPPS. Generally, commenters expressed the view that, if we adopted the approach described in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we would be violating the statutory intent that LTCHs be excluded from the IPPS in adopting the proposed IPPS-comparable payment adjustment under the revised SSO policy.

Some commenters specifically cited the Court's two-prong test for validity of a regulation established under *Chevron U.S.A., Inc.* v. *Natural Resources Defense Counsel, Inc.* 467 U.S. 837, 842–843 (1984), and asserted that the policy we discussed would fail to pass that test. Under the ruling, the Court asks whether the Congress addressed, in clear language, the issue in question and, if the answer is affirmative, the effect is given to the ''unambiguously expressed intent of the Congress.'' If the ''statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue,'' the Agency's interpretation is allowed to stand as long as it is based on a permissible construction of the statute.'' Id. at 843. Deference to the Agency's interpretation is ''only appropriate when the agency has exercised its own judgment'' and is not based upon an erroneous view of the statute. Commenters asserted that the adoption

of the revised SSO policy that we discussed would clearly violate the statutory requirement to pay LTCHs under a PPS separate and distinct from the IPPS.

Response: We disagree with commenters' contention that the LTCH PPS SSO policy that we described in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, based on an IPPS comparable payment amount, constitutes payment under the IPPS. Rather, the policy that we discussed adapts methodologies and approximate payment amounts from the IPPS to specific cases under the LTCH PPS. We have adapted many different features originally developed under the IPPS for use in the LTCH PPS, including the DRG structure, wage index adjustments (and wage index values), outlier payments, and many others. We believe that none of these adaptations constitute establishment of payment under the IPPS for LTCH hospitals.

In addition, section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA, confers broad discretionary authority on the Secretary to develop and implement a PPS for LTCHs, specifically mandating a few specific features of the new system including ''a per discharge prospective payment system'' that includes an ''adequate payment classification system'' based on diagnosis-related groups (DRGS) that reflects the differences in patient resource use and costs, and shall maintain budget neutrality.'' Section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA further provides that the Secretary ''may provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term hospital payment system, including * * * outliers * * * '' We believe that these statutory provisions provide broad authority and allow the Secretary great flexibility to fashion a LTCH PPS based on both original policies, as well as concepts borrowed from other payment systems that are adapted, where appropriate, to the LTCH context. In the instant case, the SSO policy that we discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule utilizes principles from the IPPS payment methodology and builds upon those concepts to create a LTCH PPS payment adjustment that results in an appropriate payment for those inpatient stays that we believe do not necessarily belong in LTCHs but could be treated in another setting. In this final rule, we are adopting the approach we discussed to supplement our existing SSO policy. Therefore, we disagree with commenters that the Secretary is acting in contradiction of the statute and inconsistently with the Chevron doctrine. On the contrary, we believe that this policy is consistent with the direction given to the Secretary by the Congress in the BBRA. The Congress specifically provided for the adoption of appropriate adjustments to the LTCH PPS.

Comment: Several commenters similarly objected that adopting the policy we discussed in the proposed rule would constitute a violation of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). Specifically, these commenters objected that our discussion of the policy failed to satisfy the APA's requirement that a notice of proposed rulemaking include ''the terms or substance of the proposed rule'' because we did not provide ''specific regulatory language to implement'' the policy. Commenters contended that, in the absence of this specific regulatory language, interested parties are ''improperly limited in the degree to which they are able to participate in the rulemaking process,'' even if CMS receives comments on the policy discussed.

Response: We do not agree that adopting the policy approach discussed in the proposed rule, in this final rule, would constitute a violation of the APA. Specifically, we believe that we have complied with all the applicable requirements in 5 U.S.C. 553. Among the requirements of section 553, the notice shall include the terms or substance of the proposed rule, or a description of the subjects or issues involved. Our comprehensive discussion in the proposed rule set forth the substance of the final SSO policy we are adopting in this final rule and provided a complete description of the subject and issues involved. Therefore, we believe we satisfied this and all other applicable APA requirements. Our discussion of the policy in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule that we are adopting in this final rule was detailed and specific, and even detailed the impact the change would have on payments to LTCHs, despite the absence of regulatory language. We received 270 comments on the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule. As is evident in our detailed discussion of these comments, commenters were able to provide complex, specific, and pertinent discussion of ''the terms or substance'' and ''description of the subjects and issues involved'' of the policy that we discussed.

It may be worth noting that, despite the absence of proposed, formal regulatory text, a number of commenters (including some who raised this objection) referred to the revised SSO policy that we discussed in the proposed rule with terms such as ''proposal,'' ''proposed change,'' ''proposed SSO payment methodology,'' and ''proposed policy.'' We believe that commenters clearly understood both the substance of the possible revised policy, and the fact that we might adopt the revised policy in the final rule after review of the comments.

Comment: Several commenters stated that adopting the policy discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule would be premature, since the existing SSO policy only became fully effective on October 1, 2006. Specifically, the commenters believe that there has not been sufficient time to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the policy change adopted last year to provide for a blend of unadjusted LTCH payment rates and IPPS-comparable LTCH PPS payment rates as one of the formulas for determining payment of SSOs. Some commenters stated that, as a result of last year's change, LTCHs no longer have an incentive to knowingly admit these kinds of patients.

Response: While we understand the concerns of the commenters, we believe that it is not premature to implement this revision to the SSO policy. We have been studying these cases intensively since the implementation of the LTCH PPS (which was fully effective for cost reporting periods on or after October 1, 2002, contrary to the implications of some commenters) and remain concerned that, in a considerable number of cases, LTCHs may be receiving higher payment than is warranted for cases that are also treated with similar lengths of stay at IPPS hospitals. We have a responsibility to ensure that Medicare trust fund is appropriately spent, and therefore, we do not believe that we should delay adoption of a provision to preserve the program's resources. However, if the commenters are indeed correct that last year's policy change removed any incentive to admit these kinds of SSO patients, the actual effect of the policy that we are now adopting may be relatively small and we believe that it is the CMS's responsibility to conserve the Medicare program's resources to the maximum extent that is appropriate. Therefore, we are finalizing the policy in this final rule.

Comment: Several commenters supported our goal of analyzing the role of LTCHs as one of several treatment settings among post-acute providers for Medicare beneficiaries. However, they urged us not to finalize the SSO policy that we discussed in the proposed rule that would include the alternative payment option for an SSO payment comparable to the IPPS payment amount. These commenters believe that finalizing this policy would result in drastic payment reductions and

consequential losses to the LTCHs. These commenters noted that our discussion related to serious issues about the proper place for LTCHs along the continuum of care for Medicare beneficiaries. The commenters urged us not to address these issues through payment mechanisms, but to arrive at ''clinically-based'' answers to these issues. Commenters also recommended that we wait until Research Triangle Institute (RTI) completes the next phase of its work, which includes a review of proposed and existing criteria to restrict admission to LTCHs to medically complex cases.

Response: The commenters are correct that the issue involves the role of LTCHs in the continuum of beneficiary care. As a provider category, LTCHs were created by section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act and defined by the statute as ''a hospital which has an average inpatient length of stay (as determined by the Secretary) of greater than 25 days.'' (Subclause (II) LTCHs, discussed below in these responses, which were established under the BBA of 1997, qualify as LTCHs under highly specific requirements.) As a ''prudent purchaser of care,'' we believe that we have the mandate to pay appropriately for the hospital-level services provided to Medicare beneficiaries. The RTI study, as discussed in section XI. of the preamble to this final rule, represents a highly significant step in evaluating the clinical role for LTCHs. In addition to the RTI study, there is considerable attention being focused by CMS on issues of substitution of services among provider types, and the potential for the development of a uniform assessment tool across post-acute providers. As RTI evaluates the feasibility of identifying clinically-based criteria for LTCH patients, we are concerned that patients with the same general medical profile as the same types of patients that constitute some SSO cases in the LTCH setting are also being treated at acute care hospitals, often as HCO cases. Therefore, we are finalizing this specific revision to the SSO policy, as discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, because we are concerned about the significant number of very short stay patients currently receiving treatment at LTCHs. These are patients with a LOS that is comparable to the LOS for many patients (under the same DRG) treated in acute care hospitals and paid under the IPPS. LTCHs in actuality are also acute care hospitals, they are a provider type that is distinguished solely by its focus on long-stay hospital-level care as compared to patients paid under the IPPS.

Comment: We received numerous comments that praised the quality care given to Medicare beneficiaries by the LTCHs in their areas and commenters urged us not to make significant cuts in Medicare payments which they fear would result in reduced services. The commenters asserted that the revision of the payment adjustment for SSO patients as discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule will be detrimental to the industry as costs of providing care will exceed payment. Further, the commenters stated that underpayment to LTCHs will cause patients with complex medical conditions to lose access to appropriate care and increase costs to acute care hospitals which will be forced to continue caring for these sicker patients. The commenters believed that the proposed revisions to the SSO payment policy would have a profound impact on the entire health care system of their communities since their LTCHs are a critical component of the State health care delivery system. They stated that since LTCHs offer specialized services not available elsewhere, severe cutbacks for LTCHs could resonate throughout the entire health care system.

One commenter noted that CMS made a statement that it does not expect any changes in quality of care or access to services for Medicare beneficiaries under the LTCH PPS based on proposed rule policies. However, one of the commenters stated that a decrease in payments will have pervasive effects on LTCHs. Moreover, the commenter stated that the impact of changes in our payments to LTCHs because of the proposed SSO policy revisions will not only affect services offered to ''the most vulnerable patients,'' but also will have an impact on the staff of the LTCHs. Several of the commenters specified that they envision that acute care hospitals will be overtaxed and incur additional costs without being able to provide ICU beds for patients requiring short-term acute care services. They also stated that the acute care hospitals in their communities may not be able to meet patient needs for those needing LTCH services.

One commenter cited the experience of a local faith-based, not-for-profit LTCH system that admits only very high acuity, long-term patients and realizes exceptional quality, outcomes, and cost effectiveness. But other LTCHs within the industry admit low acuity patients. The commenter stated, ''* * * many LTCH providers seek to admit chronically ill 'slow-recovery' patients as a primary target population. These patients have little difficulty meeting the 25-day LTCH ALOS criteria, and while these patients may meet continued stay criteria, we believe many could be cared for in a less acute setting.''

Response: We understand the serious concerns expressed by the commenters and, although we are finalizing the SSO policy revisions as were discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we want to assure the commenters that we are aware of their concerns. We agree that if a Medicare beneficiary is appropriately referred, and admitted, to one of the approximately 400 LTCHs in the United States for a complex medical condition, the beneficiary could receive excellent medical care from a highly-trained and committed professional staff. However, we do not believe that the revisions to the SSO policy that we are finalizing will result in LTCHs going out of business or that significant services would have to be curtailed with dire consequences for beneficiaries, staff or the local medical care system. As noted elsewhere, our data indicates the aggregate margins for LTCHs were 7.8 percent for FY 2003 and 12.7 percent for 2004. When we proposed the RY 2007 change to the SSO policy, commenters also warned that the policy would result in the closure of LTCHs with disastrous effects on the health care delivery system in those areas of the country. However, after implementing the proposed changes, we have not observed any significant reduction in the number of available LTCH beds in the country. On the contrary, we continue to observe that LTCHs are opening new LTCHs. Therefore, we believe that even with decreased Medicare payments for SSO patients, such as we are envisioning based on this finalized payment policy and detailed in the Impact (see section XV. to this final rule), we believe that LTCHs will generally be able to continue delivering high quality medical care to their patients. However, we continue to believe that acute care hospitals should not be discharging patients to LTCHs without having provided a full episode of care and we also continue to have concerns about LTCHs admitting those relatively short stay patients who could otherwise be treated in acute care hospitals.

Comment: Many commenters stated that our proposed IPPS-comparable payment option under the SSO policy could discourage physicians from discharging patients from acute care hospitals and admitting them to LTCHs. Thus, they charged that we were establishing a system in which clinical judgment is trumped by determinations based solely on payment. The commenters further stated that since

physicians discharge patients to LTCHs because it is in the patients' best interests, we would be substituting our judgment for a physician, setting a very dangerous precedent. The commenters also noted that there is available data supporting the medical determination that physicians are discharging patients to the LTCH setting because the patient's needs are better served in the LTCH setting than in an acute care hospital setting.

Response: Our objective for the revised SSO policy discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed is to preclude LTCHs and physicians from taking advantage of a system that significantly ''overpays'' (that is, relative to what would be paid for the same DRG under the IPPS) for patients that do not require the extensive resources that such high payments are intended to support. As discussed subsequently in this final rule, we recognize that some SSO cases are unavoidable due to death or an unexpected clinical improvement and early discharge. However, we have noted that in a community where both acute care and LTCH beds are available, patients are routinely transferred from the acute care hospital to the LTCH for the remainder of care because the LTCH resource is available.

As we discuss below in this section, we further compared MedPAR data on acute care hospitals regarding their LOS during CY 2003 to their LOS during CY 2005 in markets where LTCHs opened in CY 2004. We compared 304,650 acute care cases in CY 2004 to 316,816 cases in CY 2005. In CY 2003, there were 7,586 outliers, and in CY 2005, there were 5,858. The percentage of outliers in the acute care hospitals decreased from 2.5 percent to 1.8 percent and the numbers of patients that were admitted to LTCHs in those communities increased from 2,128 in CY 2003 to 6,597 in CY 2005. Furthermore, the percentage of acute care hospital discharges to LTCHs increased from 0.7 percent in CY 2003 to 2.1 percent in CY 2005. The percentage decline in total outliers between the CY 2003 and CY 2005 was −25.7 percent. The increase in LTCH discharges from CY 2003 to CY 2005 was 198.1 percent.

We are concerned that this trend has increased exponentially because it provides an acceptable disposition of the patient for the physician, and because it is an expeditious means of lowering the acute hospital's LOS and costs. We understand that the multidisciplinary approach for certain complex patients (for example, ventilator weaning) is appropriate. However, we are very concerned that the LTCH is assuming the role of the acute care hospital for many patients, at a far higher cost, which it is possible to do as long as the LTCH continues to maintain an ALOS of 25 days for purposes of qualifying for payments under the LTCH. Moreover, we do not believe that the payment policy option that we are finalizing for SSO discharges will deter physicians from delivering appropriate care to beneficiaries or from making appropriate referrals in the interests of their patients to LTCHs. Furthermore, LTCHs remain free to accept these patients. In finalizing this payment policy, we are seeking to remove any financial incentive that could encourage a LTCH to admit a patient from an acute care hospital prior to that patient having received a full episode of care at the acute care hospital.

Comment: Several commenters cited a study centered at Barlow Respiratory Hospital that charted the course of ventilator weaning treatment for 1419 medically unstable patients at 23 LTCHs from March 2002 through February 2003. The study reported that more than 50 percent of this group of patients were weaned from the ventilators and showed improvement, both neurologically and functionally. The commenters asserted that this study exemplifies the excellent level of care for such patients at LTCHs.

Response: We agree with the commenters that the results of the ''Barlow'' study indicate a significant rate of very positive outcomes for the very sick LTCH patients who were included in the study. In the late 1990s, we sponsored a ventilator demonstration study which included, among other acute care settings the Mayo Clinic and Temple University Hospital that also reported impressive results. Furthermore, we understand that the results of the Barlow study were used for the establishment of national ventilator-weaning protocols issued by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and utilized by all acute care hospitals. We also understand that input from the Temple University program continues to be critical in formulating national standards. We believe that these programs established a level of excellence that should be emulated by all hospital-level facilities that treat ventilator-dependent patients, including acute care hospitals, LTCHs, and IRFs. Accordingly, we believe it is not simply the fact that the patient is treated at a LTCH that is critical to predicting positive results. Rather, it is the type of clinical intervention that is furnished to the patient at the hospital. In many cases that intervention is currently exemplified at acute care IPPS hospitals, as well as at LTCHs.

Comment: Several commenters claimed that even for what we would term ''appropriate'' admissions, our proposed payment option under the SSO policy that could generate an IPPS-comparable payment will erect barriers to the use of LTCHs. One commenter asserted that typical LTCH patients (described by the commenter as elderly patients with persistent multiple-system failures who are de-conditioned and protocol-resistant) respond impressively to the aggressive blending of therapeutic interventions, interdisciplinary teams, and medical intervention that is not otherwise available in the community or tertiary hospital setting. The commenter stated that from ''a case rate reimbursement perspective,'' grouping such a ''treatment-resistant'' population with the rest of the general acute care population is highly inappropriate. Some commenters asserted that even when adjusted for HCOs, acute care hospitals are not designed or intended to provide service to long-term care-type patients. The commenters emphasized that acute care hospitals are not designed to provide extended care services, unlike LTCHs, with their specially-trained expert staff and clinicians and multi-disciplinary approaches. One commenter noted that LTCHs are like acute care hospitals but must sustain a high level of care for longer periods.

Response: We disagree with the contention that acute care hospitals are not capable of providing extended hospital level care services such as the care provided in LTCHs. Although there may be communities with LTCHs where the acute care hospitals may have functionally ''restricted'' their services because of the presence of these LTCHs, as well as because of the financial advantages and clinical niche that they have sought to fill, acute care hospitals are equipped to provide services to the same population, and the IPPS under which they are paid, is calibrated based on the resources needed to treat those patients. Moreover, because there are over 3,500 acute care hospitals and approximately only 400 LTCHs, which are not distributed uniformly throughout the U.S. (for example, few are located in California), currently many acute care hospitals are providing care for the vast majority of Medicare beneficiaries requiring the type of care described by the these commenters. Our FY 2005 MedPAR files indicate that 20 percent of cases treated at acute care hospitals nationwide have lengths of stay between 7 and 14 days (that is, 2,386,057 out of a total of 11,855,205

cases). Additionally, 5.2 percent of acute care hospital cases (617,219) or have LOS greater than 14 days. In those acute care hospitals, we believe that during these longer periods those patients are receiving the same high level of care in an acute care hospital paid under the IPPS as they would receive as patients at a LTCH.

Comment: Several commenters claimed that we based our proposed revision of the SSO policy that could have resulted in an IPPS-comparable payment for a particular SSO case, on the incorrect assumption that ''short stay'' LTCH patients are clinically similar to short term acute care hospital patients. They stated that the SSO thresholds (5/6 of the geometric ALOS for each LTC–DRG) were never intended to be a measure of the appropriateness of a LTCH admission, but rather, were mathematically-derived from the per diem payment amounts, which were based on a methodology that would produce a payment-to-cost ratio for SSO cases close to one. Furthermore, a commenter stated the presence of a SSO patient does not indicate a premature discharge from an acute care hospital, and cited that 11 percent of the patients had previously qualified as HCOs at the referring acute care hospital.

Additionally, the commenters asserted that we are mistaken in our claim that LTCHs can foresee the LOS for patients admitted to LTCHs or predict likely deaths, where in actuality, upon admission, there is generally no substantial clinical difference between long stay and ''short stay'' patients. Commenters found it to be incongruous that a patient in LTC–DRG 475 (Respiratory System Diagnosis with Ventilator Support) would still be an SSO patient (for example, 28 days for LTC–DRG 475) and could be hospitalized in a LTCH for greater than 25 days (the definition of a LTCH). A case such as this could be appropriately treated in a LTCH. The commenters noted that physicians cannot and should not be asked to predict the LOS or the likely death of severely ill patients.

Commenters further asserted that we have made an erroneous assumption that LOS equates to ''severity of illness'' (SOI) and is a proxy for the appropriateness of an admission. However, the commenters assert that this is not the case. They outlined another incorrect belief in the proposed rule that LTCHs function like acute care hospitals when they have patients for the same LOS. On the contrary, the commenters asserted that SSO patients are being admitted because they look just like ''inliers,'' and we have proposed that LTCHs absorb payment rates that bear no relationship to the costs of furnishing patient care at the LTCH level.

Furthermore, based on claims analysis, using the APR–DRGs, the medical complexity and mortality rates of SSO patients, as measured by the SOI and ''risk of mortality'' (ROM) standards are very similar to that of the LTCH ''inlier'' patient population. The commenters further presented comparisons between these measures for SSO patients and for patients with the same DRGs in acute care hospitals, indicating that 52 percent of all patients admitted to LTCHs were in the highest APR–DRG ROM categories, whereas only 24 percent of acute care patients are in those same categories, resulting in a total percentage of APR–DRGs 3 and 4 at LTCHs among the SSO population that is approximately double that of acute care hospitals. The commenters noted that higher patient acuity correlates to higher utilization of facility resources, and hence, higher costs, which argues against our proposed policy that would significantly lower reimbursements for SSO cases. Several commenters also provided a comparison of case mix indices (CMI) for LTCH SSO cases and cases at acute care hospitals. The commenters asserted that SSOs at LTCHs have a relative CMI that parallels the CMI of LTCH ''inlier'' cases at LTCHs and which is 72 percent higher than the comparable CMI at acute care hospitals.

Response: We understand that not every SSO patient can be so identified at the time of admission to a LTCH. Further, we recognize that many patients who will eventually be defined as SSO patients because their LTCH stay is equal to or less than 5/6 of the geometric ALOS for their particular LTC–DRG, may, upon admission, present the same severity of illness and risk of mortality as ''inlier'' LTCH patients. As we discuss subsequently in this final rule, we selected the threshold of one standard deviation above the average LOS of an IPPS discharge as an appropriate measure to select the subset of SSO cases that are typically treated in acute care hospitals. We agree that the general SSO threshold (5/6 of the geometric ALOS for each LTC–DRG) was never meant to be a measure of the appropriateness of a LTCH admission, but rather, was mathematically-derived from the per diem payment amounts. We believe this enabled us to arrive at a reasonable payment policy at the outset of the LTCH PPS for cases that had lengths of stay significantly shorter than those patients fitting the typical profile of those who are treated at LTCHs. We recognize that a LTCH admission could be a medically-complex admission (an appropriate LTCH admission) with a relatively long LOS and still be considered an SSO case. We also acknowledge that, in some cases, LTCH admissions could also have qualified as HCOs at the referring acute care hospital. However, we still have concerns that patients in LTC–DRGs with significantly shorter stays than the ALOS for that particular DRG might have been unnecessarily admitted to the LTCH rather than receiving their care at an acute care hospital. In addition, we are adjusting the LTCH PPS to appropriately pay for those SSO stays that have a LOS that is comparable to the LOS for that DRG under the IPPS and consume far less than a full array of services in the LTCH for the particular LTC–DRG.

We believe this policy is appropriate since our data indicates a correlation between the LOS at an acute care hospital for a patient following treatment at the highest level of intensity (ICU or CCU), that is, the number of ''recuperative'' days, and whether or not the patient was admitted to a LTCH upon discharge from the acute care hospital. An analysis of the CY 2004 MedPAR files revealed that for the specified DRGs for acute care cases following ICU/CCU days, there were significantly fewer ''recuperative'' days for acute care HCO patients that were discharged and admitted to a LTCH than for those patients that were discharged directly from the acute care hospital. For example, for acute care cases in DRGs 475 (Respiratory system diagnosis with ventilator support) and DRG 483 (Trach with mechanical vent 96+ hours or PDX except face, mouth and neck diagnosis), the number of ''recuperative'' days were considerably shorter at the acute care hospital if there was a discharge followed by an admission to a LTCH. We believe that this data confirms MedPAC's assertion in the June 2004 Report to Congress that ''patients who use LTCHs have shorter acute hospital lengths of stay than similar patients'' (p. 125).

Furthermore, we agree that some SSO patients become so by virtue of death or a faster than expected recovery and early discharge, and that in certain LTC–DRGs, the SSO threshold still requires a relatively long hospital stay (for example, DRG 475, Respiratory System Diagnosis with Ventilator Support). However, in the absence of better admission criteria, we are concerned that LTCHs are admitting some SSO patients that could have received their full care at the acute care hospital or SNF-level facility.

We disagree with comparisons made by some commenters concerning the SOI and ROM of LTCH SSO patients to those of acute care patients based on similar lengths of stay and case-mix indices. Generally, LTCH patients that had been previously hospitalized in an acute care hospital received the diagnostic work up and major interventional treatment during that initial stay. Assuming that the patient continued to need hospital-level care after being somewhat stabilized and was discharged to a LTCH, the discharge to a LTCH could have been determined as clinically appropriate. The clinical status of this patient at this point cannot be reasonably compared to a typical patient who is treated in the acute care hospital and who is grouped to the same DRG. This is the case because the original patient has already been treated at that initial level and has required additional hospital-level care either by remaining at the acute care hospital, which would be paid for under the IPPS (perhaps as a HCO), or by being admitted to a LTCH where the stay could either be a SSO or an ''inlier.'' The only valid comparison of the SOIs and ROMs of two such patients in the context of the commenter's concerns would be to contrast the SOI and ROMs of the patient at the LTCH with the patient who, following the same initial intervention at the acute care hospital, continued treatment at the acute care hospital. In addition, it is not appropriate to compare the average CMI at acute care hospitals to the average CMI at LTCHs. The acute care hospital CMI is affected by a broad range of cases, so that the only appropriate comparison is between DRGs in acute care settings and DRGs in LTCHs, which is the approach we have adopted in the revised SSO policy we are finalizing in this final rule. In regions of the country where LTCHs are scarce, acute care hospitals treat the same cases that are treated in LTCHs where those facilities are available. In those areas, acute care hospitals do indeed treat the most severe cases, and the calibration of the DRG weights takes into account the resource requirements for such cases. In the light of this fact, we do not believe that it is necessary or appropriate to pay LTCHs more for cases that can be successfully treated in acute care hospitals. We understand that the option that we are finalizing, paying for some SSO stays based on the IPPS-comparable amount, will result in significant payment reductions to LTCHs for some SSO cases. However, we still believe that this modification to the SSO policy is appropriate since it ensures that payments to the LTCH are not greater than the program would pay in a different setting of care, where these patients can also be successfully treated. At the outset of the LTCH PPS, we established the SSO payment adjustment to address this distinction which we continue to believe is a valid and reasonable consideration for Medicare payments to LTCHs (67 FR 55995, August 30, 2002).

Comment: Many commenters asked that we not finalize the proposed SSO policy revisions, stating that the SSO payment option that could pay the LTCH based on an amount comparable to what would otherwise have been paid under the IPPS was not based on solid data analysis and supportable conclusions. In fact, a number of commenters asserted that the proposed policy was not based on data but rather on ''erroneous and unsubstantiated assumptions'' that all SSO patients are inappropriately admitted to LTCHs and inappropriately discharged from acute care hospitals. The commenters noted that, because of the way in which the policy was formulated, the percentage of LTCH cases that are paid under the SSO payment policy was a function of the SSO threshold and the dispersion of cases above and below the ALOS for the LTC–DRGs. That is, statistically, the SSO definition at 5/6 of the geometric ALOS would necessarily produce approximately 37 percent of cases as SSOs. Therefore, under the commenters belief that given the regulatory 5/6 definition of SSOs, which we had not proposed to change, the percentage of SSO cases was not amenable to change just based upon LTCHs admission policies. One commenter noted that for a significant number of patients to fall below 5/6 ALOS for a LTC–DRG is expected in a LTCH. Additionally, commenters noted that a case may qualify as a SSO because the patient has run out of covered days, regardless of the actual LOS in the LTCH and that in establishing our policy for qualifying as a LTCH (that is, meeting the average greater than 25-day LOS for a particular cost reporting period), we have recognized the ''appropriateness'' of including ''total'' rather than just ''covered'' days of a stay, since regardless of the payer, if the patient is still receiving hospital-level care, the facility is functioning like a LTCH. For this reason, these commenters urged us to remove such cases from the calculations we used to develop a SSO payment policy. Some commenters expressed concerns about the reliability of the data that underlay our policy proposals and asserted that our proposals are based on faulty assumptions, insufficient data, and a fundamental lack of understanding of the valuable care LTCHs provide. Moreover, the commenters asserted that LTCH patients are just not the same type of patients as acute patients; they believe that our proposed policies indicate that we are unaware of the distinction between acute care patients and patients at LTCHs. They further stated that they did not believe that the public was able to submit meaningful comments to our proposed policies because of our data flaws, our biases, and the resulting policies that we proposed.

Response: As we have stated previously, we are aware that the vast majority of LTCH patients are admitted following treatment at acute care hospitals. The patient's stay at the acute care hospital generated a Medicare payment under the IPPS, and the subsequent admission to a LTCH, an acute care hospital with an ALOS of greater than 25 days, will generate an additional Medicare payment. To protect the Medicare Trust Fund from what may be inappropriate and unnecessary payments, and to ensure that the program is not paying twice for the same episode of care, we believe it is essential that we evaluate those cases that are admitted for an unusually short stay following an initial treatment at another acute care hospital to acute care hospitals that specialize in long-stay care, since that second stay will generate another Medicare payment. In MedPAC's June 2004 Report to the Congress, the Commission stated that, ''* * * Living near a LTCH increases a beneficiary's probability of using such a facility. For example, living in a market area with a LTCH quadruples the probability of LTCH use. Being hospitalized in an acute hospital with a LTCH located within the hospital also quadruples the probability that a beneficiary will use a long-term care hospital'' (page 125).

Although we acknowledge that our establishment of the 5/6th of the geometric ALOS threshold, from a statistical standpoint, will result in approximately 37 percent of LTCH cases being defined as SSOs, we are extremely concerned with the number of cases that are being treated in LTCHs that fall *considerably* below the geometric ALOS for any given LTC–DRG. In fact, as stated previously, in the commenters' specific suggestions for how to reasonably and fairly pay SSOs, the commenters themselves drew a distinction between those cases that fall within the definition of a SSO but are more in keeping with the LOS generally

associated with a LTCH (for example, a case assigned to LTC–DRG 482 with SSO threshold of 32.1 days, would still be paid as a SSO if the patient was treated in the LTCH for 25 days) and those cases that many commenters referred to as ''very short stay outliers (VSSO)'' or ''very short stay discharges (VSSD).'' In our revised SSO policy, the payment formula particularly takes into account our very strong belief that LTCHs are acute care hospitals that specialize in treating patients requiring ''long-stay'' hospital-level care.

The LTCH PPS has been designed and calibrated to pay specifically for that type of care. Since the inception of the LTCH PPS, when we established the SSO adjustment (67 FR 5594 through 55995, August 30, 2002) at § 412.529, we have provided that if a LTCH treats patients not requiring a long stay for that DRG, Medicare pays the LTCH based on the applicable payment adjustment option. Furthermore, as we revise the payment options in this final rule for the SSO policy, we continue to believe that such a payment adjustment is reasonable for all short stay patients, including those that die shortly after their admission to the LTCH. The FY 2004 MedPAR data indicates that 43 percent of all patients that die in LTCHs are deaths that occur within the first 14 days of the stay, with 35 percent of SSO deaths occurring within the first 7 days following admission. As we have since the inception of the LTCH PPS, we continue to believe that Medicare payments for those death cases occurring within the SSO threshold should be determined under the SSO policy since the length of the patient's treatment in the LTCH did not utilize the full measure of hospital resources for which the full LTC–DRG payment was calibrated.

Conversely, MedPAR data indicate that of all SSO cases, approximately 60 percent of the discharges are 14 days or less and also that acute care hospitals treat a significant percentage of patients for longer than the 5-day ALOS. (In acute care hospitals, paid under the IPPS, over 20 percent, in the aggregate, of patients that are treated have a LOS of between 14 and 7 days.) Therefore, as described below, we believe that the SSO policy that we are finalizing under the LTCH PPS provides a fair and reasonable payment, in light of our stated concerns that the short-term hospital-level care that LTCHs provide for many SSO cases may be substituting for care that could otherwise be delivered at acute care hospitals and for which at best, Medicare would otherwise pay under the IPPS.

Under § 412.507(b), Medicare will pay for inpatient care delivered only on those days that the beneficiary has coverage until the LOS exceeds the SSO threshold and becomes an inlier stay. Therefore, since the inception of the LTCH PPS, we established the distinction between ''covered days'' and ''total days'' of a LTCH stay. At the point when a patient's benefits exhaust, the patient is ''discharged for payment purposes'' and even though the patient may continue to be hospitalized at the LTCH, Medicare will pay only for the covered days, with the patient (or the patient's secondary insurance) being responsible for the remaining days' LTCH costs. For example, even though a patient could have been treated in an LTCH for 40 days, if upon admission, the patient only had 20 covered days remaining, for Medicare payment purposes, the stay could qualify as a SSO, unless the 20 covered days exceeded the 5/6th threshold for the LTC–DRG to which the case was grouped, at which point, the stay would become an inlier stay and a full LTC–DRG payment would be generated. Several commenters urged us to remove SSO cases occurring as a result of such lapses of Medicare coverage from our revised SSO policy but based on our data analysis, we will not be excluding benefit exhausted cases from the policy. According to FY 2005 MedPAR data, these cases constitute only 3.31 percent of SSO cases. It has been our policy since the beginning of the LTCH PPS to count those stays during which benefits are exhausted as SSOs if the covered portion of the stay is less than 5/6th of the geometric ALOS for the DRG. In this way, we appropriately determine payment based on the part A-covered stay. At the same time, we continue counting the total days of the stay for purposes of qualification as a LTCH, because that calculation is intended to reflect the length of care provided to Medicare beneficiaries. However, our policy of including total days for Medicare patients to identify hospitals qualifying (or continuing to qualify) as LTCHs indicates our recognition that conceivably, a beneficiary may be appropriately treated in a LTCH for example, for 40 days; and yet because the beneficiary had only 5 remaining benefit days, would be reported in our claims data as a 5-day SSO case. We may revisit this issue in the future and, at that time, would solicit comments to that end. However, at present, since a very small percentage of SSO cases are caused by beneficiaries exhausting benefits, the ''short'' SSO cases discussed above in this section, will continue to be governed by the SSO policy finalized in this rule.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the SSO policy would penalize LTCH providers in a situation where a patient developed a new or unexpected complication during his or her LTCH stay and required treatment that can only be provided by the referring acute care hospital.

Response: The situation to which the commenter is referring is possible and may result in a sudden discharge from a LTCH and a readmission to the acute care hospital. In such a case, if the total covered length of stay at the LTCH is less than 5/6 of the LOS for the LTC–DRG to which the case is assigned, payment would be made under the SSO policy. Consequentially, the additional payment option that we are finalizing could also be applicable if the covered LOS at the LTCH fell within the IPPS-comparable threshold prior to discharge. Such payment would be appropriate because the patient would have received less than a full episode of care at the LTCH prior to being discharged back to the acute care hospital. We note that should the patient subsequently be discharged from the acute and readmitted to the LTCH to continue treatment begun before the acute episode, Medicare payment to the LTCH would be governed under our interrupted stay policy at § 412.531. We would also note that this stay could also be subject to adjustment under the SSO policy (including the payment option that we are finalizing) depending upon the total covered length of stay (both prior to and following the acute episode).

Comment: Many commenters stated that their objections to the policy discussed in the proposed rule extended to the existing SSO payment policy with which they have expressed disagreement in the past. Several of these commenters asserted that the current SSO threshold (5/6 of the geometric ALOS for each LTC–DRG) is not statistically justifiable. These commenters recommended that, if we are going to employ LOS as the only criterion for determining SSOs, we should logically select a threshold that better identifies cases that are dissimilar to the median or average, such as the 5th percentile through 10th percentile.

Response: We believe that the policy we are adopting in this final rule is a consistent extension of the principles that we have employed in developing the SSO payment policy. In this rulemaking cycle, we have not introduced any discussion or proposals concerning the existing SSO threshold, and therefore, we are not implementing

the commenters' recommendation that we establish a dramatically-revised threshold level. However, we did provide an exhaustive discussion of the reasons for adopting this threshold in the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55995), which included statistical analysis, various simulations, regressions, and consideration of various options.

Comment: Several commenters stated that the objective of the SSO policy that we discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule is to establish a *de facto* exclusionary policy, prohibiting the admission of these patients to LTCHs by means of a payment mechanism rather than careful clinical review.

Response: We disagree that we are establishing an exclusionary policy. On the basis of analysis that we presented in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule and previously in this final rule, we believe that many of these cases may represent ''premature and inappropriate discharge from the acute care hospital and inappropriate admission to the LTCH'' (72 FR 4840). The intent of this policy is to establish an appropriate payment level for this class of cases. Hospitals remain free to accept these patients. As we stated in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, * * * a short stay case at a LTCH most likely did not receive a full course of medical treatment during the short stay and* * * a full LTC–DRG payment would therefore, be inappropriate'' (72 FR 4804).

Comment: Several commenters objected that the policy we discussed could apply to cases whose length of stay exceeds 25 days, the ALOS required for a hospital to qualify as an LTCH. Commenters indicated that at least 9 IPPS DRGs have an ALOS plus one standard deviation that is greater than 25 days, and at least 26 other IPPS DRGs have an ALOS plus one standard deviation that exceed 20 days. Commenters contended that cases exceeding the 25-day threshold for qualifying as an LTCH should not be considered short stay cases.

Response: We do not believe that it is inappropriate for individual cases that exceed the ALOS threshold for LTCH status to be considered SSOs. In fact, we have treated some such cases as SSOs since the establishment of the SSO policy. For a number of LTC–DRGs, the SSO threshold, 5/6 of the geometric ALOS, significantly exceeds 25 days. These include DRGs 498, 499, 520, and others. Similarly, a number of IPPS DRGs have an ALOS plus one standard deviation that is greater than 25 days. As a result, many cases with lengths of stay shorter than 25 days receive payment under the SSO methodology, and a subset of those cases will be paid specifically under the formula that we are adopting in this final rule for certain cases: For SSO cases with a length of stay less than ALOS plus one standard deviation of the IPPS DRG, payment will be no greater than the IPPS comparable amount that we have defined. These results are appropriate because the respective thresholds serve different purposes. The 25-day threshold defines an ALOS established by the statute to define a LTCH. The respective outlier thresholds (the basic SSO threshold of 5/6 of the geometric LTC–DRG ALOS, and the threshold that we are now adopting to identify every SSOs) serve to identify subsets of LTCH cases for appropriate payment treatment, based on comparisons to relevantly similar cases. We have explained the basis for adopting the SSO threshold in the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55995). The threshold that we are adopting in this final rule, the geometric ALOS plus one standard deviation of the IPPS DRG, selects a subset of SSOs that are similar to cases successfully treated in short-stay acute care hospitals. Since these cases have received a course of treatment similar to the typical course of treatment in an IPPS hospital, we are limiting payment for them to an amount no greater than the comparable payment under the IPPS.

Comment: Several commenters stated that we had not presented any conclusive financial or clinical evidence to support the policy discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, but that we instead rely merely on statements such as: ''many LTCHs *appear* to be admitting some SSO patients that could have received the care at the acute care hospital.'' (72 FR 4806) (Emphasis supplied by commenter.) Furthermore, a commenter stated that our own expert consultant, RTI, had failed to find evidence conclusively illustrating that the typical LTCH SSO patient could be treated as effectively in an acute care hospital. Some of these commenters also maintained that, contrary to our suggestions, the care received by patients at LTCHs is often unique and not available at acute care hospitals. Commenters cited physicians who were consulted on the clinical aspects of transfer from an acute care hospital to a LTCH. These physicians provided numerous explanations and scenarios detailing how LTCHs provide different kinds of services even if the DRG for a case is nominally the same.

Response: As we have discussed elsewhere in this final rule, LTCHs are certified as acute care hospitals and acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS are throughout the country treating beneficiaries requiring hospital-level care lengths of stay comparable to those that are typical of LTCHs. We disagree with commenters who imply that there is a clear distinction between the patients that are appropriate for successful treatment at LTCHs and patients that are appropriately and successfully treated at acute care hospitals. Across the United States, the nearly 3,600 acute care hospitals that discharge approximately 12.7 million Medicare beneficiaries treat the full range of medical issues that the commenters identify as LTCH cases. We do not question that many LTCHs have highly regarded reputations for their success in treating respiratory and ventilator cases (MS–LTC–DRGs 207 and 208). However, as detailed in the RTI report, the 2004 MedPAR files indicate that where LTCHs treated 13,394 cases assigned to DRG 475 in 2004, acute care hospitals treated 18,727 Medicare patients with an additional 7,072 HCOs in DRG 475. For DRG 88, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), LTCHs treated 4,894 cases where acute care hospitals treated 37,523 cases. Data on other common DRGs treated in LTCHs as compared to the same DRGs treated in acute care hospitals reflect a similar pattern, particularly among the DRGs that could fall into the broad category of ''medically complex'' patients, which are the majority of LTCH patients (Table 3–2, RTI report, p. 35. We understand that MedPAC and RTI have noted that many LTCHs deliver a high level of care to very sick Medicare beneficiaries, with fine doctors, exemplary nursing care, and top-notch rehabilitation therapists, but we also know that many acute care hospitals throughout the nation are treating the same patients and similarly delivering excellent care, especially where there are few LTCHs. We also know that some LTCHs specialize in a particular subset of patients and achieve a noteworthy success in their treatment (for example, of patients requiring ventilator weaning or wound care). However, similar patients are also receiving care in acute care hospitals. Therefore, we cannot agree with commenters implying that acute care hospitals are incapable of competently treating Medicare beneficiaries that happen to fall within the DRGs that LTCH identify as their specialties and that any patients falling into such categories would receive ''substandard'' care at an acute care hospital.

Comment: Several commenters stated that our proposed policy should not apply to cases that were HCOs at an acute care hospital prior to transfer to a LTCH. Since such cases received the full complement of services at the acute care hospital, and the acute care hospital actually incurred significant losses before receiving an outlier payment from the Medicare program, it cannot be stated that any discharge and transfer to a LTCH was premature and inappropriate.

Response: We agree that, in such cases, the transfer to a LTCH is unlikely to be premature and inappropriate. In fact, typically, HCO cases in the acute care setting represent a full course of treatment in that setting. However, as our discussion in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule indicates, this is not the only, or even the primary, factor that deserves consideration in determining an appropriate SSO payment level. Regardless of whether a case had reached outlier status in an acute care hospital prior to transfer to a LTCH, the course of treatment at the LTCH could more closely resemble the normal course of treatment at an acute care hospital than the normal course of treatment for cases at a LTCH. We stated in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule that cases ''with lengths of stay that are equal to or less than the IPPS ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRGs under the IPPS appear to be comparable to typical stays at acute care hospitals'' and ''LTCHs that admit SSO patients with lengths of stay more typical of an acute care hospital may be, in fact, behaving like acute care hospitals'' (72 FR 4806 citing 71 FR 27847). For purposes of the SSO policy discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, the issue is primarily the course of treatment actually received at the LTCH, rather than the course of treatment at the acute care hospital prior to transfer to a LTCH. Of course, one reason the course of treatment at a LTCH may resemble the normal course of treatment at an acute care hospital *may* be that an acute care hospital has prematurely and inappropriately transferred a patient to a LTCH. However, in cases where a patient has received a high level of treatment at an acute care hospital, including levels of treatment that qualify for outlier payments, a subsequent stay in an LTCH may still ''be comparable to typical stays at acute care hospitals.'' (72 FR 4806) In these cases, since we believe the Congress excluded LTCHs from the IPPS because cases with longer lengths of stay (as compared to acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS) tend to be costlier than cases with shorter stays, we do not believe that it would be appropriate for the program to pay an LTCH an unadjusted LTCH PPS payment for case with such an abbreviated stay that it did not receive the full course of treatment particularly when we would pay a much lower amount in to an acute care hospital for a similar course of treatment.

Comment: Several commenters urged us not to apply the policy we discussed to cases in which patients die in the hospital. These commenters noted that physicians and hospitals are not able to predict which patients will die subsequent to admission to an LTCH. In addition, many of these patients are high cost, requiring significant medical resources in the last days of life. One LTCH commenter determined that about 50 percent of its extreme SSOs were discharged due to death. The commenter notes that it may not be appropriate for these cases to receive a full LTCH payment, but that it is equally unfair for CMS to assume ''sinister intent'' and to financially penalize LTCHs operating in good faith. Some commenters emphasized generally that adoption of the revised SSO policy that we discussed would be unfair to LTCHs because they cannot predict in advance who will become SSO cases. There are several reasons why a patient could become an SSO including the patient dying or leaving against medical advice. Many of these commenters noted that if this policy is adopted, LTCHs will only receive, at best, costs for SSO cases. Other commenters recommended that, if we adopt this policy, it should incorporate outlier payments when determining an equivalent IPPS payment amount in the SSO payment methodology.

Response: We certainly acknowledge that hospitals and physicians are not able to predict with certainty at admission which patients will die during an inpatient stay in a LTCH, or whether a patient will leave against medical advice. However, the issue with regard to these cases, as with the cases discussed in the previous comment, is that ''lengths of stay that are equal to or less than the IPPS ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRGs under the IPPS appear to be comparable to typical stays at acute care hospitals.'' The point is not to penalize LTCHs, but rather, to pay appropriately for cases that receive less than the full course of treatment at a LTCH. Even when a patient dies in a LTCH, whether unexpectedly or not, cases with lengths of stay more typical of an acute care hospital are not receiving the full course of treatment in a LTCH, and resemble more the course of treatment in acute care hospitals. It is therefore appropriate to limit the payment for such cases accordingly. We would also like to note that where a LTCH is finding that nearly half of its patients are discharged due to death, if in fact many of these patients are SSO cases, the LTCH may need to consider whether those patients were too fragile to be transferred from the acute care hospital to the LTCH. Transfer trauma is a serious issue that must be considered whenever a hospital considers transferring a patient to another facility.

With respect to the recommendation that we take outlier payments into account when determining the equivalent IPPS payment amount in the SSO payment methodology, under existing LTCH PPS policy, a SSO case that meets the criteria for a LTCH PPS HCO payment at § 412.525(a)(1) (that is, if the estimated costs of the case exceed the adjusted LTC–DRG SSO payment plus the fixed loss amount) would receive an additional payment under the LTCH PPS HCO policy at § 412.525(a) (67 FR 56026, August 30, 2002). For purposes of HCOs under the proposed SSO policy, we would continue to use a fixed-loss amount calculated under § 412.525(a), and not a fixed-loss amount based on § 412.80(a). Medicare would pay the LTCH 80 percent of the costs of the case that exceed the sum of the applicable option of the least of the four proposed payment options, described above, and the fixed-loss amount determined under § 412.525(a).

Comment: Several commenters stated that the payment reductions associated with the very short SSO policy discussed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule violate the principles of a PPS in which some cases are expected to cost less than others.

Response: We disagree that these policies violate the principles of averaging found in a PPS. As we stated in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, ''* * *we believe it is very important to evaluate the adjustment in light of the fact that in a PPS there are numerous principles that we try to balance simultaneously when making policy decisions. Among these principles are appropriate payment, predictability, averaging, beneficiary access to appropriate care, and equity so that while the averaging principle is an important one in PPSs, it is not the only principle that guides our policy decisions. For example, in the case of SSOs and HCOs, we must determine how to appropriately to pay for aberrant cases that are much shorter (that is, SSOs) and much costlier (that is, HCOs) when compared to typical cases in the

relevant LTC–DRG. In the case of short stays, if we failed to adjust the payment to reflect that the case did not receive the full resources of a typical LTCH stay for the particular DRG, the PPS would be greatly ''overpaying'' for the stay, could serve as an incentive to game the system, and would also waste valuable Medicare Trust Fund dollars. Similarly, in the case of HCOs, if we did not adjust the payment to reflect the extraordinary high costs that LTCH was incurring for treating a particular patient when compared to a typical case in the respective LTC–DRG, we would be ''underpaying'' significantly for the case. We have stated that providing additional money for HCOs strongly improves the accuracy of the payment system as well as reduces the incentive to under serve these patients. Since we do not pay SSOs or HCOs an amount paid to ''inliers'/cases that have length of stays or costs commensurate with other cases in the respective but instead make payment adjustments to reflect the unique circumstances of these cases, the averaging principle is less heavily emphasized under these circumstances to achieve equity, appropriate payments that accurately reflect resource costs at the patient and hospital level, and beneficiary access to medical care.''

We believe that, given that LTCHs are defined as acute care hospitals that have an average inpatient LOS of greater than 25 days, the payment policies under the LTCH PPS appropriately reflect the averaging principle. That is, where some cases, within the ''inlier'' range will have generated relatively lower costs, other cases will generate higher costs and Medicare will pay a LTCH the same for both less and more costly cases. The SSO policy, along with the HCO policy addresses payments for cases that fall outside of the normal types of averaging in the inlier range in the PPS and ensures that payment for SSO cases is not greatly in excess of the resources required to treat those cases. (71 FR 27866 through 27867)

Comment: Some commenters asked that we comment on why the IPPS post-acute transfer policy does not appropriately adjust for payment when transferred cases ultimately become SSO discharges in the LTCH setting. Another commenter suggested that, we provide policies under the acute IPPS side to address inappropriate, or early discharges and asked that post-acute transfer rules, readmission rules and DRGs for acute care hospitals should be used to minimize the issue instead of penalizing LTCHs.

Response: We note that we addressed the effect of the post-acute transfer policy on SSOs previously in the RY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule, but will reiterate that the IPPS post-acute transfer provision was created to address cases in which the transferring acute hospital provides less than the full spectrum of care for the qualified DRG and to avoid providing an incentive for a hospital to transfer a patient to another hospital early in the patient's stay to minimize costs while still receiving the full DRG payment. The post-acute transfer policy only addresses the appropriate level of payments for the course of treatment received in an acute care hospital. It does not address the appropriate level of payments at the facility to which the patients are then transferred.

We note that the post-acute care transfer policy only affects DRGs that meet the criteria at § 412.4. Although we expect the post-acute transfer policy to have some impact on the discharge behavior of acute care hospitals because of the reduced payments that they will receive for qualified discharges, the post-acute transfer policy does not necessarily affect the issues being addressed by the SSO policy change. Both the IPPS post-acute transfer policy and the revised SSO policy being finalized in this rule are designed to ensure that Medicare payments are appropriate given the types of treatment provided in each setting; we note that in the instance of an acute transfer (that is subject to the post-acute transfer policy) to an LTCH that discharges the patient as an SSO, neither the acute nor the LTCH facility provided the full episode of care to the patient and it would not be appropriate to pay either facility a full DRG payment. We believe that the revised payment formula for SSO patients that we are finalizing will appropriately pay LTCHs for delivering services to patients who do not otherwise require the lengths of stay that are characteristic of LTCHs. The SSO policy will address payments to LTCHs for patients discharged from the acute care hospital even after the IPPS geometric ALOS, who are subsequently discharged from the LTCH as a short SSO.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that rather than challenging the cases that are admitted from acute care hospitals, we should be more concerned about inappropriate admittances from nonhospital settings such as SNFs or elsewhere.

Response: After analyzing recent data, we note that approximately 80 percent of the patients admitted to the LTCHs come from the short term acute care hospitals and only 20 percent are admitted from other nonhospital settings. Since SNFs do not offer hospital-level care but are still serving patients with compromised health, we believe that a decision to transport a SNF patient to a hospital would generally be made because the patient appears to the medical professionals at the SNF to be in need of a higher level of medical treatment or care than is available at the SNF. (In fact, such patients would typically be admitted to the acute care hospital rather than to a LTCH.) However, both an acute care hospital and a LTCH offer acute hospital-level care. As discussed previously in this final rule, we are very concerned about the treatment of a short-stay patient who could reasonably and effectively continue to be treated in an acute care hospital and paid for under the IPPS, being admitted unnecessarily to a LTCH, which specializes in treating patients requiring long-term hospital-level care and paid for under a PPS which has been calibrated based upon the high resource use associated with long patient stays. Furthermore, admission of such a patient could also result in an unnecessary and inappropriate LTCH hospitalization, which would also result in a second Medicare payment under the LTCH PPS for what was essentially, one episode of care.

Comment: Several commenters believe that we are incorrect that LTCHs could be admitting patients not requiring long stays, noting that LTCHs actually have a disincentive to admit short stay patients because LTCH certification status can be at risk if the hospital does not maintain an ALOS of more than 25 days.

Response: Under the TEFRA system, all inpatient days (whether covered by Medicare or not) were included in the LOS computation, and the mathematical determination was based upon the number of patient days, during the cost reporting period when they occurred, divided by discharges occurring during that same period of time (67 FR 55954, 55971). With the establishment of the per discharge LTCH PPS, we restricted the patient count for purposes of qualifying as a LTCH solely to Medicare patients (67 FR 55971), and we implemented the policy of 'days following the discharges,' under which, if a patient's stay crosses two cost reporting periods, the total days of that stay (both covered and non-covered days) would be included in the computation during the cost-reporting period that the discharge occurred (69 FR 25706).

LTCH cost report data reveal that the general ALOS of most LTCHs varies only slightly. Generally, LTCHs maintain an ALOS that is just over 25

days, meeting the statutory definition of a LTCH, that is, having an ALOS of greater than 25 days. Furthermore, we understand that LTCHs closely monitor their yearly ALOS and that one extremely long-stay case can mathematically offset for a number of short-stay cases. After studying the hospital-specific data, we believe that this is indeed the case for many LTCHs. We also believe that the payment policy that has been utilized since the start of the LTCH PPS for FY 2003 has not operated as a financial disincentive for the admission of patients who will not ultimately require long-stay hospital-level care. In fact, we note that MedPAR data show approximately 27,000 SSO cases with a LOS of 14 days or less. This indicates that even with over 20 percent of their discharges having such a short ALOS, LTCHs have maintained their greater than 25-day statutory ALOS. Therefore, we believe that it is both possible for a LTCH to maintain its designation and also admit many very short stay cases.

Comment: Several commenters maintained that the SSO policy we discussed would have unintended effect of lengthening patients stay. Some of these commenters specifically noted that this effect could be the result of a payment ''cliff'' where payments rise abruptly once the threshold for the application of this policy (the ALOS of the IPPS DRG plus one standard deviation) is reached. The commenters believe that the proposed rule introduced ''backwards'' incentives associated with the old ''cost-based'' system. Policies will result in encouraging a profit for longer stays, which could raise costs to the Medicare program.

Response: We acknowledge that there could be such a cliff effect in some cases as a result of the policy that we are adopting. However, we believe that the merits of adopting this limitation on outlier payments in certain cases outweighs the risks of some possible, unintended consequences. We will monitor experience under the new policy to detect whether there is an inappropriate increase in lengths of stay that are slightly greater than the ALOS plus one standard deviation of the comparable IPPS DRGs. As part of our program integrity responsibilities, we may ask the FIs to review the medical necessity of the last few days of a LTCH stay that just exceeds the threshold, and if some days are determined not to be ''medically necessary,'' then if the remaining days result in a LOS lower than the threshold, the stay may be paid at the IPPS comparable rate.

Comment: Some commenters contended that the concerns behind the possible revision to the SSO policy could be more appropriately addressed by establishing patient criteria and QIO review of medical necessity for admissions, as has been recommended by MedPAC and RTI.

Response: Under our QIO program, QIOs review services to determine whether services are reasonable and medically-necessary, whether the quality of services meets professionally-recognized standards, and whether services in an inpatient hospital or other inpatient health care facility could, consistent with the provision of appropriate medical care, be effectively provided more economically on an outpatient basis or in an inpatient facility of a different type. We have not historically interpreted any of these areas of review to involve determinations of which kind of acute care facility would be appropriate, and QIOs do not regard short term acute care hospitals and LTCHs as facilities ''of a different type.'' A QIO uses criteria, based on typical patterns of practice. The QIOs also consult with (a) physician(s) and practitioner(s) actively engaged in practice in that State and to the extent possible, in the same specialty, when making the determination that care was or was not medically-necessary. Although a QIO review can detect whether or not the patient requires an acute level of care or whether care in a SNF would have been appropriate, since both acute care hospitals and LTCHs are certified as acute care hospitals, QIOs do not make the distinction between whether a patient should be hospitalized at an acute care hospital or at a LTCH, so long as the patient requires an acute level of care.

QIOs are authorized by statute to determine whether, in case such services and items are proposed to be provided in a hospital or other health care facility on an inpatient basis, such services and items could, consistent with the provision of appropriate medical care, be effectively provided more economically on an outpatient basis or in an inpatient health care facility of a different type as specified in section 1154(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Therefore, QIOs have authority to determine the appropriate hospital-level setting in the face of objective criteria. But there is no objective criteria distinguishing between settings where acute care is delivered. Since the statute states ''a facility of a different type,'' and because short term acute care hospitals and LTCHs are very similar and provide the same level of care, we have at no time interpreted ''a facility of a different type'' in section 1154(a)(1)(C) of the Act to mean that QIOs must distinguish between them.

In a memorandum issued to the Regional Offices, Chief Executive Officers, and all QIOs, from the Director of the Quality Improvement Group of the CMS Office of Clinical Standards on October 28, 2004, among other matters, the following policy was further clarified:

> **Note:** there are different provider types that may offer the same level of intensity of inpatient care. QIOs do not specify which provider type should be used when the level of intensity is the same. For example, a patient requires an acute level of care that could be delivered in a short—term acute care PPS hospital, a long-term care hospital or an acute rehabilitation hospital. The QIO determines what intensity of care is appropriate (that is, the patient requires an acute level of care) but would not specify as a matter of admission necessity which provider type the patient should be admitted to. If the QIO determines that there is a quality of care concern implicated, that issue should be addressed through the quality review process.

Under current contracts, QIOs review LTCH cases under the following circumstances: When a claim is selected for purposes of determining or lowering the payment error rate; if there is a QIO-identified need to perform additional review based on their contractual responsibilities; if there is an immediate appeal of certain beneficiary notices; as a result of the referral of a case or cases; or when there is a beneficiary complaint or other quality of care concern.

Since one of the recommendations made by MedPAC in their June 2004 Report to Congress was for an increased role for the QIOs in monitoring criteria to assure that LTCHs are treating appropriate patients, researchers from RTI have been in contact with several QIOs nationwide in order to evaluate their role. However, involving QIOs in the on-going determination of the appropriateness of admissions, continuing stay or discharge for a significant proportion of LTCH patients was never envisioned when the QIO program was established. There will not be a reassignment of Medicare funds to QIOs from the LTCH PPS. However, we are currently developing the next Quality Improvement Organization Scope of Work. These comments will be considered in that process.

After consideration of the numerous comments submitted on this issue, we are finalizing the policy that we discussed in the proposed rule. That is, in SSO cases where the covered LOS is equal to or less than the ''IPPS

comparable threshold'' (defined above in this section) of the same DRG under the IPPS, the SSO payment methodology will be based upon the least of the following: 100 Percent of estimated costs of the case as determined under § 412.529(d)(2); 120 percent of the LTC–DRG per diem multiplied by the covered LOS of the case as determined under § 412.529(d)(1); the Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG as determined under § 412.529(d)(3); or an LTCH PPS amount comparable to the IPPS per diem.

Technical Correction

We are making a technical correction to existing § 412.529(a) which would add the term ''covered'' immediately before the phrase ''length of stay'' in the initial definition of a SSO case. This technical correction is not a substantive policy change but rather corrects the regulatory definition of a SSO case so that it is consistent with policy determinations that we have made since the FY 2003 implementation of the LTCH PPS. We would note that utilizing only Medicare covered days for payment purposes has been our policy from the outset of the LTCH PPS, as is specified at § 412.503 where we defined ''discharge'' for purposes of payment, as ''* * * when the patient stops receiving Medicare-covered long-term care services * * *.'' Furthermore, in subsequent revisions of our SSO policy, we included the term ''covered'' at § 412.529(c)(2)(iv)(A), § 412.529(d)(1) and § 412.529(d)(4)(i)(B). We are making this technical correction to conform all references at § 412.529 to our existing policy regarding a SSO discharge which is determined based on the number of ''covered'' days in the patient stay.

3. Determination of Cost-to-Charge Ratios (CCRs)

In the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117 through 48121), similar to the revisions to the HCO policy as discussed in IV.D.3.d. of the preamble of this final rule, we revised our methodology for determining the annual CCR ceiling and Statewide average CCRs under the LTCH PPS because we believe that those changes are more consistent with the LTCH PPS single payment rate for inpatient operating and capital costs. Under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, the LTCH CCR ceiling specified under § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(C)(2) is calculated as three standard deviations above the corresponding national geometric mean total CCR (established and published annually by CMS). (As discussed in greater detail in this section, the fiscal intermediary (FI) may use a Statewide average CCR if, among other things, a LTCH's CCR is in excess of the LTCH CCR ceiling.) The LTCH total CCR ceiling is determined based on IPPS CCR data, by first calculating the ''total'' (that is, operating and capital) IPPS CCR for each IPPS hospital and then determining the average ''total'' IPPS CCR for all hospitals. The LTCH CCR ceiling is then established at 3 standard deviations from the corresponding national geometric mean total CCR. (For further detail on our methodology for annually determining the LTCH CCR ceiling, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48117 through 48119).) We also established that the LTCH ''total'' CCR ceiling used under the LTCH PPS will continue to be published annually in the IPPS proposed and final rules, and the public should continue to consult the annual IPPS proposed and final rules for changes to the LTCH total CCR ceiling that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1 each year. Accordingly, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119), we established a FY 2007 LTCH total CCR ceiling of 1.321, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006.

In addition, under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, for discharges on or after October 1, 2006, we revised our methodology to determine the Statewide average CCRs under § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(C) for use under the LTCH PPS in a manner similar to the way we compute the ''total'' LTCH CCR ceiling using IPPS CCR data (71 FR 48120). Specifically, under this revised methodology, we first calculate the total (that is, operating and capital) CCR for each IPPS hospital. We would then calculate a weighted average ''total'' CCR for all IPPS hospitals in the rural areas of the State and weighted average ''total'' CCR for all IPPS hospitals in the urban areas of the State. (For further detail on our methodology for annually determining the LTCH urban and rural Statewide average CCRs, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119 through 48121).) We also established that the applicable Statewide average ''total'' (operating and capital) CCRs used under the LTCH PPS will continue to be published annually in the IPPS proposed and final rules, and the public should continue to consult the annual IPPS proposed and final rules for changes to the applicable Statewide average total CCRs that would be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1 each year. Accordingly, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48122), the FY 2007 LTCH PPS Statewide average total CCRs for urban and rural hospitals, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, were presented in Table 8C of the Addendum of that final rule (71 FR 48303).

Additionally, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119), under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we established under the LTCH PPS SSO policy at § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(C) that the FI may use a Statewide average CCR, which is established annually by CMS, if it is unable to determine an accurate CCR for a LTCH in one of the following three circumstances: (1) New LTCHs that have not yet submitted their first Medicare cost report (for this purpose, a new LTCH would be defined as an entity that has not accepted assignment of an existing hospital's provider agreement in accordance with § 489.18); (2) LTCHs whose CCR is in excess of the LTCH CCR ceiling; and (3) other LTCHs for whom data with which to calculate a CCR are not available (for example, missing or faulty data). Other sources of data that the FI may consider in determining a LTCH's CCR included data from a different cost reporting period for the LTCH, data from the cost reporting period preceding the period in which the hospital began to be paid as a LTCH (that is, the period of at least 6 months that it was paid as a short-term acute care hospital), or data from other comparable LTCHs, such as LTCHs in the same chain or in the same region.

Furthermore, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48121), we established under § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(B) that, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, the CCR applied at the time a claim is processed will be based on either the most recently settled cost report or the most recent tentatively settled cost report, whichever is from the latest cost reporting period. Under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, in that same final rule, we also established at § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(A) that, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, we may specify an alternative to the CCR computed under § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(B) (that is, computed from the most recently settled cost report or the most recent tentatively settled cost report, whichever is later), or a hospital may also request that the FI use a different (higher or lower) CCR based on substantial evidence presented by the hospital. A complete discussion of these revisions to our methodology for determining a LTCH's CCR is

discussed in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48119 through 48121).

4. Reconciliation of SSO Cases

In the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48121 through 48122), under the broad authority of section 123 of the BBRA and section 307(b)(1) of BIPA, we revised § 412.529(c)(3)(iv) (D) through (E), for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, to codify in subpart O of 42 CFR part 412 the provisions concerning the reconciliation of LTCH PPS outlier payments, including editorial clarifications discussed in greater detail below in this section, that would more precisely describe the application of those policies.

Specifically, at § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(D), similar to our current policy, we specified that for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, any reconciliation of outlier payments will be based on the CCR calculated based on a ratio of costs to charges computed from the relevant cost report and charge data determined at the time the cost report coinciding with the discharge is settled. In addition, at § 412.529(c)(3)(iv)(E), we specified that for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006, at the time of any reconciliation, outlier payments may be adjusted to account for the time value of any underpayments or overpayments. Such an adjustment will be based upon a widely available index to be established in advance by the Secretary and will be applied from the midpoint of the cost reporting period to the date of reconciliation. We made these additional revisions to § 412.529(c)(3) because we believe that these changes would be more consistent with the LTCH PPS single payment rate, and because we believe it would be more appropriate and administratively simpler to include all of the regulatory provisions concerning the determination of LTCH PPS outlier payments applicable under the LTCH PPS regulations at subpart O of 42 CFR part 412. (For a complete discussion on the revisions made to the SSO reconciliation policy, refer to the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48121 through 48122).)

Comment: One commenter requested that we clarify how we interpret the 10 percentage point criterion of the SSO and HCO reconciliation policy.

Response: We did not propose any changes to the current reconciliation policy. Therefore, we do not believe this final rule is the appropriate vehicle to address this comment. As we have stated, we intend to issue subregulatory guidance on LTCH reconciliation that would be similar to the IPPS reconciliation process and would address the commenter's question.

B. Expansion of Special Payment Provisions for LTCH Hospitals Within Hospitals (HwHs) and LTCH Satellites: Expansion of the 25 Percent Rule to Certain Situations Not Currently Covered Under Existing § 412.534

In the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, we established the special payment provisions at § 412.534 for LTCHs that are HwHs and for satellites of LTCHs that are co-located with host hospitals. In developing that policy, we were particularly concerned with patient shifting between the host acute care hospitals and the co-located LTCH HwH or satellite for financial rather than for medical reasons, a scenario that we believed was encouraged by physical proximity, and that resulted in inappropriate increased cost to the Medicare program (69 FR 49191). We specified that the payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534 was also applicable to host hospitals other than acute care hospitals that served as hosts to LTCH HwHs or satellites of LTCHs since we had similar concerns to those stated above regarding patient shifting between such hosts and their co-located LTCHs. However, the vast majority of host hospitals continue to be acute care hospitals (69 FR 49198).

In the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, we quoted the FY 1995 IPPS final rule where we first discussed our concern that LTCH HwHs were, in effect, operating as step-down units of acute care hospitals. We explained that this was inconsistent with the statutory framework and that such a configuration could lead to Medicare making one payment to the acute care hospital and another under LTCH PPS for what was essentially one episode of care (69 FR 49191 through 49192, and 59 FR 45389).

When we first established the separateness and control criteria for LTCH HwHs at § 412.22(e) in the FY 1995 IPPS final rule, our main objective was to address the shifting of costly, long-stay patients from the host to the on-site LTCH, resulting in two hospital stays which would result in a financial windfall for both providers. We sought to protect the integrity of the IPPS by ensuring that those costly, long-stay patients who could reasonably continue treatment in an acute care hospital would not be unnecessarily discharged to an onsite LTCH, a behavior that would undermine the Medicare IPPS DRG payment system for acute care hospitals. We explained that the Federal standardized payment amount for the IPPS was based on the average cost of an acute care patient across all acute care hospitals for the base year. This is premised on the assumption that, on average, both high-cost and low-cost patients are treated at hospitals. Although Medicare may pay a hospital less than was expended by the hospital for a particular costly case, the hospital could also receive more than it expended for other, less costly cases. However, an acute care hospital that consistently discharges higher cost patients to a post-acute care setting for the purpose of lowering its costs, undercuts the foundation of the IPPS DRG payment system which is based on averages, as noted above. Because the course of acute treatment had not been completed, the hospital inappropriately would have incurred lower costs under the IPPS. It did not incur additional costs for what would have been the remainder of the patient's stay at the IPPS acute care hospital. We were concerned that once that patient was discharged from the IPPS acute care hospital, the patient, still under active treatment for the same condition, would be admitted to a LTCH, thereby generating a second admission and Medicare payment that often would not have taken place but for the availability of the LTCH (59 FR 45389 through 45393).

With the growth of satellites of excluded hospitals, another category of co-located facilities, we established ''separateness and control'' policies applicable to satellites, which we defined at § 412.22(h) as ''a part of a hospital that provides inpatient services in a building also used by another hospital or in one or more entire buildings located on the same campus as buildings used by another hospital.'' In the FY 2003 IPPS final rule at § 412.22(h), we finalized additional regulations governing the satellites of hospitals (64 FR 41532 through 41535 and 67 FR 50105 through 50106).

As detailed in the FY 2005 proposed and final rules for the IPPS (69 FR 28323 through 28327, 69 FR 49191 through 49214), with the explosive growth in the number of LTCH HwHs and concomitant cost to the Medicare program, we reevaluated the effectiveness of existing policies regarding HwHs. (OSCAR data showed that there were 105 LTCHs in 1993 of which 10 were HwHs. By October 2005, there were 373 LTCHs of the majority which were HwHs.) We considered whether our regulations sufficiently protected the Medicare program from the problems that we envisioned in the FY 1995 IPPS final rule. We also questioned the effectiveness of the ''performance of basic hospital functions'' aspect of the ''separateness

and control'' requirements alone because we were aware that some co-located providers had been establishing complex arrangements among corporate affiliates, and had obtained services from those affiliates, masking true corporate identities, and therein, diluting or impairing the effectiveness of the separateness criteria in determining whether both hospitals were interrelated. While technically remaining within the parameters of the rule, these arrangements intermingled corporate interests so that the corporate distinctness was lost, thus side-stepping the intent of our regulations. (Although we have had similar concerns regarding patient movement between host hospitals and their satellites, there had never been any ''performance of basic hospital functions'' criteria established in § 412.22(h) because satellites are part of another hospital, and therefore, share a Medicare provider number with ''the hospital of which they are a part'' thus making it administratively burdensome to distinguish between the inpatient operating costs of the main hospital and its satellite(s).)

In the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, following serious consideration of the public comments that we received on our proposed policy revisions for LTCH HwHs and satellites (69 FR 28323 through 28327) and further evaluation of the issues, regulatory changes were finalized for HwH separateness and control policies at § 412.22(e) and a new payment adjustment was established for LTCH HwHs and satellites of LTCHs, at § 412.534. (We wish to note that the term ''satellite facility'' in this section refers to satellites of excluded hospitals, in particular, LTCHs, and does not include satellites of excluded units at § 412.25.)

Specifically, in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 49091 through 49214), effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004, for LTCHs we eliminated the performance of basic hospital functions test under § 412.22(e)(5)(i), the 15 percent test under existing § 412.22(e)(5)(ii), and the 75 percent of admissions from other than the host criteria at § 412.22(e)(5)(iii). A LTCH that met administrative separateness and control requirements at § 412.22(e)(1)(i) through (e)(1)(iv), under our finalized policy, satisfied the LTCH HwH requirements. (As noted above in this section, the performance of basic hospital functions test does not exist for satellites; therefore, we did not similarly revise § 412.22(h).) However, we established a new payment adjustment at § 412.534 based upon annual threshold criteria for LTCH HwHs or LTCH satellites of 25 percent (or an applicable percentage) for LTCH discharges who were admitted from their host hospitals.

Section 412.534, Special payment provisions for long-term care hospitals within hospitals and satellites of long-term care hospitals, provides that if a LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite's discharges that were admitted from its host hospital exceed 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) of its total Medicare discharges for the LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite's cost reporting period, an adjusted payment would be made at the lesser of the otherwise payable amount under the LTCH PPS or the amount payable under the LTCH PPS that would be equivalent to what Medicare would otherwise pay under the IPPS. In determining whether a hospital met the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) criterion, patients transferred from the host hospital that had already qualified for outlier payments at the host would not count as a discharge that had been admitted from the host. (We commonly refer to this throughout the preamble and regulations text as the discharge not being counted towards the applicable threshold.)

It is important to note that if the hospital exceeds its threshold, LTCH discharges admitted from the host before the LTCH exceeds the 25 percent threshold would be paid an otherwise unadjusted payment under the LTCH PPS.

We also finalized additional adjustments to the 25 percent policy for specific circumstances. For an LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite located in a rural area, there is no payment adjustment applied under § 412.534 if no more than 50 percent, rather than 25 percent, of the Medicare patients discharged from the LTCH or satellite were admitted from the host. In addition, in determining the percentage of patients admitted from the host, any patients that had been Medicare outliers at the host and then discharged to the rural LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite would be considered as if they were admitted to the LTCH or satellite from a non-host hospital. In addition, in the case of a LTCH or LTCH satellite facility that was co-located with the only other hospital in the MSA or with an MSA-dominant hospital, as defined at § 412.534(e)(4), a payment threshold was established that we believed responded to ''the unique needs of these communities'' (69 FR 49207). Under § 412.534(e)(2), we do not adjust payments to those LTCH HwHs or LTCH satellite facilities as long as the percentage of Medicare patients discharged from the LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite that were admitted from the urban single or MSA dominant host hospital, did not exceed the percentage of the *total* Medicare discharges in the MSA in which the hospital is located that were discharged from the host hospital, for the cost reporting period for which the adjustment would be made, but in no case is the percentage less than 25 percent or more than 50 percent. In addition, in determining the percentage of patients admitted to the LTCH from the urban single or MSA dominant host hospital, any patients that had been Medicare outliers at the host and then transferred to the LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite would be considered as if they were admitted to the LTCH from a non-host hospital. (When we refer to ''the 25 percent (or applicable percentage)'' patient threshold throughout this final rule, the ''applicable percentage'' refers to these special adjustments that we have provided for the special circumstances of rural, urban-single, or MSA-dominant LTCHs or to the percentage associated with the transition policy, discussed below in this section.)

When implementing this policy, we also provided for a 4-year transition for existing LTCH HwHs or LTCH satellites that met the applicable criteria outlined in the regulations to allow these LTCHs a reasonable period during which hosts and co-located LTCH HwH or LTCH satellites and specific ''LTCHs under formation'' would be able to adapt to the requirements of the new policy. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005, these transitioned hospitals were to be grandfathered, with the first year as a ''hold harmless'' year. However, even for facilities that were being phased-in to the full payment adjustment, in the first cost reporting period, the hold harmless year, the percentage of discharges admitted from the host hospital to the LTCH could not exceed the percentage of discharges admitted from the host hospital to the LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite in its FY 2004 cost reporting period. (For the purposes of § 412.534, the hospital's cost reporting period during FY 2004, the last cost reporting period prior to the implementation of § 412.534, is the ''base period'' for purposes of establishing the gradual phase-in of the full payment threshold adjustment (69 FR 49196).)

After the first grandfathered cost reporting period, these LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities were required to meet a percentage transition over the 3-year period beginning in FY 2006. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2005, but before October

1, 2006, the percentage of Medicare discharges that may be admitted from the host with no adjustment may not exceed the lesser of the percentage of their discharges admitted from their host during its FY 2004 cost reporting period or 75 percent. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006 but before October 1, 2007, the percentage of Medicare discharges that may be admitted from the host with no adjustment may not exceed the lesser of the percentage of its Medicare discharges admitted from its host during its FY 2004 cost reporting period or 50 percent, and finally, 25 percent (or other applicable percentage) beginning with cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2007. Additionally, the 25 percent policy for co-located LTCHs is currently implemented in a location-specific manner. That is, the computation of the percentage of LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite discharges admitted from a host is based solely on the admissions from the physically co-located host and not from other campuses or remote locations which may share a common Medicare provider number with the host.

Although the payment adjustment at § 412.534 focused on LTCH HwHs and satellites of LTCHs and its host hospitals, the relationship between a receiving provider and any referring hospital has been an issue of concern for the Medicare program, even in the absence of co-location. Under section 1886(d)(5)(J) of the Act, added by section 4407 of the BBA of 1997, the Congress provided for a post-acute transfer policy which addressed certain patient discharges from acute care hospitals that subsequently received additional treatment delivered by a second Medicare provider. We believe that the Congress enacted this legislation to discourage acute care hospitals from prematurely discharging patients to another treatment setting in order to increase Medicare payment.

The Congress' enactment of the legislation authorizing the post-acute transfer policy is indicative of its serious concerns about patient shifting between acute and post-acute providers. In the case of the post-acute transfer policy, described above in this section, we focused on overpayment, under the IPPS, to the transferring hospital when a patient is prematurely discharged to another provider during the same episode of illness.

The payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534 was based on concerns similar to those underlying the post-acute transfer policy at § 412.4, that is, an inappropriately truncated hospitalization at a host facility and an admission to another provider, specifically a LTCH, for which an additional Medicare payment would be generated. However, the payment adjustment at § 412.534 is not applied to the transferring hospital but rather, to discharges from the co-located LTCH to which the presumably prematurely discharged patient has been admitted. Moreover, although the referring hospital under the post-acute transfer policy must be an acute care hospital, for the purposes of the payment adjustment at § 412.534, any hospital is a potential host if it is co-located with a LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite.

When we proposed the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs in the FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule, MedPAC expressed concern that the 25 percent patient threshold policy would have a significant impact and could possibly lead to an inequitable situation for co-located LTCHs, as compared to freestanding LTCHs. Among their concerns were the following: Freestanding LTCHs also have strong relationships with acute care hospitals, and that where on average LTCH HwHs receive 61 percent of their patients from their hosts, on average freestanding LTCHs receive 42 percent of their patients from their primary referring hospital; a 25 percent rule that only applied to LTCH HwHs and not to freestanding LTCHs could be inequitable; and if this policy approach applied the adjustment only to HwHs and satellites it could be circumvented by an increase in the number of freestanding LTCHs instead of LTCH HwHs (69 FR 49211).

In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we also stated that according to a commenter, the data indicated ''* * * that it is common practice for LTCHs * * * to admit patients from a single-source acute care hospitals'' and that 71.2 percent of freestanding LTCHs admit more than 25 percent of their patients from a single source acute-care hospital (71 FR 27878).

Additionally, in comments received on the FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule to preclude common ownership of a host and a HwH (which was not finalized), two commenters asserted that the financial incentive to accept inappropriate patients from an acute care hospital could exist only when the acute care hospital and the LTCH were commonly owned and when there was common governance, a situation that ''can exist even without co-location, that is, a freestanding LTCH, exempt from the requirements of § 412.22(e) could be owned and governed by the hospital from which it receives the majority of its referrals' (69 FR 49202). Despite the commenters' assertions, we do not believe that either common ownership or co-location are the only circumstances under which financial incentives exist for acute care hospitals to prematurely discharge Medicare patients to LTCHs for additional treatment during the same episode of patient care. In fact, we are aware of the existence of ''arrangements'' between Medicare acute and post-acute hospital-level providers that may not have any ties of ownership or governance relating to patient shifting that appear to be based on mutual financial gain rather than on significant medical benefits for the patient. This could be the case if an acute care hospital discharges a Medicare beneficiary who continues to require hospital-level care primarily to preclude that patient's case from reaching outlier status at the acute care hospital, to an LTCH for additional treatment. Under this scenario, Medicare would pay the acute care hospital under the IPPS for the beneficiary's care but the hospital would be able to avoid both losing the ''fixed loss'' amount and absorbing 20 percent of the remaining costs for the outlier patient's care, as established under the IPPS outlier policy at subpart F of part 412. Medicare would also be responsible for a payment, to the LTCH, under the LTCH PPS upon the patient's discharge from the LTCH. Accordingly, we believe that additional regulation in this area is both necessary and appropriate to protect the Medicare Trust Fund when generating two payments under two different payment systems for what was essentially one episode of beneficiary care.

When we finalized the payment adjustment at § 412.534, which focused solely on co-located LTCHs, that is, LTCH HwHs and satellites of LTCHs, and as we subsequently noted in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, we took considerable note of these comments and we have continued since that time to monitor the relationships between referring hospitals and LTCHs (71 FR 27878). Specifically, at that time we also analyzed patient claims data from the FY 2004 MedPAR files for acute care patients who are admitted to freestanding LTCHs. We have analyzed the discharge and LOS information from this data to evaluate whether there was a significant difference in patient shifting behavior between co-located LTCHs and their host acute care hospitals and those freestanding LTCHs that admit a majority of their patients from particular referring acute care hospitals. (As stated previously, for the

purposes of the payment adjustment at existing § 412.534, any inpatient hospital-level provider is a potential host if it is co-located with a LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite (69 FR 49198). Similarly, freestanding LTCHs also admit patients from sources other than acute care hospitals. However, our data reveals that approximately 80 percent of all LTCH admissions are from acute care hospitals. Therefore, our data analysis discussed below in this section, focuses on the relationship between a referring acute care hospitals and LTCHs.)

We also analyzed more recent data on relationships between LTCHs and acute care hospitals from which they received a significant percentage of referrals. The RY 2005 MedPAR files indicate that only 73 of the then 200 freestanding LTCHs admitted 25 percent or less of their Medicare discharges from an individual acute care hospital; for 82 of those freestanding LTCHs, the percentage was between 25 and 50 percent; for 33 it was between 50 and 75 percent, and for 6 percent of those freestanding LTCHs it was between 75 and 100 percent of their Medicare discharges that were admitted from one acute care hospital. Thus, the data indicates that for over 60 percent of all freestanding LTCHs, over 25 percent of their discharges were for patients admitted from an individual acute care hospital.

Generally, the data reveals minimal differences for cases grouped to the same DRG between the ALOS at the acute care hospital prior to an admission to a co-located LTCH and the ALOS at a referring acute hospital prior to admission to a freestanding LTCH. For example, when we finalized the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534, we evaluated data from CY 2004 MedPAR files regarding LTC–DRG 475, Respiratory System Diagnosis with Ventilator Support, for both LTCH HwHs with more than 25 percent of their discharges admitted from their host hospital and freestanding LTCHs with more than 25 percent of their discharges admitted from an individual referring hospital. The ALOS for patients stays that have not reached outlier status at the host prior to being discharged to the co-located LTCH was 12.7 days and for freestanding LTCHs, the average LOS at their individual referring hospital was 12.9 days. Similarly, for LTC–DRG 416, Septicemia, the ALOS at the host acute care hospital was 9.8 days prior to admission to the co-located LTCH and the prior ALOS at the individual referring acute care hospital was 9.6 days prior to admission to the freestanding LTCH. Even though we finalized the percentage threshold payment adjustment only for co-located LTCH HwHs and satellites at that time, we believed that this data indicates considerable similarity between the patient-shifting behavior at acute care hospitals with co-located LTCHs and acute care hospitals with LTCHs with which they are not co-located. We would have expected the LOS at the acute care hospital that discharged patients to non-co-located LTCHs to be longer.

Furthermore, as noted above in this section, we have concentrated on the relationships between acute care hospitals and non-co-located LTCHs in this discussion, because approximately 80 percent of Medicare patients in LTCHs are admitted from acute care hospitals. However, we believe that the same concerns, articulated above, would also exist when the patient source is not an acute care hospital. There could still be a financial incentive on the part of the referring hospital (for example, an IRF, to prematurely discharge a beneficiary to a LTCH for additional post-acute treatment in order to avoid absorbing high treatment costs under the IRF outlier policy at § 412.624(e)(5)) that would result in two Medicare payments, one to the initial provider and the other under the LTCH PPS for, what is actually, a single episode of beneficiary care. (We recognize that a patient could experience a medical crisis while an inpatient at an IRF, but typically, the most appropriate setting for such urgent care would be a general acute care hospital, rather than a LTCH.)

We believe that this data gives further credence to concerns articulated by MedPAC and the assertions made by the Lewin Group in their comments on our FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule regarding the ''strong relationships'' for referral purposes that exist between many acute care hospitals and freestanding LTCHs. Although, our decade-old concerns, about LTCHs functioning as long-stay or step-down ''units'' of acute care hospitals, focused on co-located LTCHs (HwHs and LTCH satellites), we believe that this data indicates that many freestanding LTCHs may also be serving the same purpose as those that are co-located, that is, as functional step-down units of their primary referring acute care hospital.

We are also concerned about other attempts to evade our regulations at § 412.534. In implementing the HwH regulations at § 412.22(e) and the satellite regulations at § 412.22(h), we have consistently utilized the definition of ''campus'' that was established in the provider-based regulations at § 413.65(a)(2) which specifies that a campus is ''the physical area immediately adjacent to the provider's main buildings, other areas and structures that are not strictly contiguous to the main buildings but are located within *250* yards of the main buildings, and any other areas determined on an individual basis, by the CMS regional office, to be part of the provider's campus.'' We have become aware of certain LTCH companies that have both established new LTCHs and are considering relocating existing HwHs or LTCH satellites so that they are at least 300 yards from the acute care hospital, thus side-stepping the intent of existing § 412.534. We believe that extending the existing payment policy will also address the type of ''gaming,'' described above in this section.

We first noted in the RY 2006 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27878) our concern that in many cases that the line of ''functional separateness'' between freestanding LTCHs and their major referral sources appears to have been erased. We believe that our analysis of patient movement between these facilities supports these concerns.

Therefore, under the broad authority conferred on the Secretary by section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA to implement a prospective payment system for LTCHs, including authority to provide for appropriate adjustments to the payment system, we proposed the extension of the payment adjustment at § 412.534, presently applicable to co-located subclause (I) LTCHs, to *all* subclause (I) LTCHs (section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act), as explained below in this section. (For the purposes of the discussion of this policy, a ''subclause (I) LTCH'' is also intended to include satellites of these LTCHs. Our proposal regarding subclause (II) LTCHs, that is those LTCHs that meet the definition at section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act, is discussed below in this section.) Specifically, at § 412.536, we proposed regulations that govern payments under the LTCH PPS for LTCH and LTCH satellite Medicare discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH.

The proposed policy provisions of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment apply to any subclause (I) LTCH or LTCH satellite regardless of the physical proximity to the hospital from which it is accepting admissions. In order to apply this policy at all subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites, we proposed to additionally revise existing § 412.534 to include a new provision at § 412.534(h) that

would extend the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold to those grandfathered co-located subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites at § 412.22(f) and § 412.22(h)(3)(i), respectively, for Medicare discharges that had been admitted from the grandfathered LTCH or LTCH satellite facility's host for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. (We address the issue of satellites of subclause (II) LTCHs below in this section.) We proposed adding § 412.536 that applies a comparable payment adjustment governing Medicare discharges from subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites that were admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH.

The proposed payment adjustment at § 412.536 applies to those Medicare discharges from co-located subclause (I) LTCHs (HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities) that have been admitted from hospitals other than those with which they are co-located. We believe that this policy addresses our concerns with LTCHs and LTCH satellites that in many cases appear to be functioning like step-down units of acute care hospitals.

Furthermore, we believe it is appropriate that the same analytical standards and payment policies be applied by Medicare to all subclause (I) LTCHs. Therefore, we proposed amending existing § 412.534 to include subclause (I) grandfathered LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities, as well as using the same thresholds applicable to co-located LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities for subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities that admit Medicare patients from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, under § 412.536.

Specifically under the proposed policy, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, as we specified in revised § 412.534(h), this proposed payment adjustment would have included those subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and satellites that had been ''grandfathered'' under § 412.22(f) and § 412.22(h)(3)(i), respectively, and that are presently exempted from the existing payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs. As noted previously, both grandfathered HwHs at § 412.22(f) and satellite facilities at § 412.22(h)(3)(i) would be permitted to retain their exclusions from the IPPS despite not meeting ''separateness and control'' policies with regard to their relationships with their host hospitals, as long as they continued to comply with applicable Medicare requirements. This inclusion of grandfathered LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites in the proposed 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold policy would not effect their ability to continue to be ''grandfathered'' and excluded from the IPPS. Moreover, as noted above, the 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) threshold policy governing discharges from subclause (I) LTCHs that had been admitted from any individual referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, at § 412.536, would also apply in determining payments under the LTCH PPS for Medicare discharges from LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites, including grandfathered HwHs and LTCH satellites, that had been admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH (that is, referring hospitals other than their hosts).

Under the policies applicable to grandfathered subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites, we proposed to pay an adjusted amount for those discharged Medicare patients that were admitted from their co-located host, under § 412.534(h) or from any other referring hospital under § 412.536, in excess of the applicable percentage threshold. The grandfathered LTCHs and LTCH satellite facility's Medicare discharges that reached outlier status at the host, at § 412.534(h), or at the referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, at § 412.536, would not count towards the applicable threshold.

We believed that since we proposed expanding the 25 percent policy to all subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities it was appropriate to include LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites grandfathered respectively under § 412.22(f) and § 412.22(h)(3)(i). We proposed that the provisions at § 412.534(h) would apply for Medicare discharges from grandfathered LTCH and LTCH satellite facilities admitted from co-located hospitals and the provisions at § 412.536 would apply for discharges admitted from the referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH. As we noted in our RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule regarding grandfathered HwHs, ''[W]e do not believe that it is reasonable to assume that by creating a limited exception for these hospitals, the Congress was immunizing these facilities from any further regulation by the Secretary as to their growth and financial impact on the Medicare program. We do not believe the Congress was establishing a separate class of providers'' (71 FR 48109).

As noted in the proposed rule, when we implemented the existing 25 percent (or applicable percentage) for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004, we opted to implement on a ''location-specific'' basis rather than based on Medicare provider numbers. That is, we applied the percentage threshold payment adjustment only to discharges from a specific location of a LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite that was admitted from the host hospital with which they share a building or campus. However, since implementing this policy, we have been contacted by numerous representatives of LTCH chains whose questions appear to indicate that the site-specific implementation of the threshold percentage had resulted in patient-shifting between hospital locations that shared a Medicare provider number and even between separately owned LTCHs (for their mutual advantage) that side-stepped the intent of our policy. Specifically, we offer the following example of a situation that was occurring: a host hospital at Location A was discharging patients to a LTCH HwH or satellite at Location B while the host hospital at Location B discharged patients to the LTCH HwH or satellite at Location A.

We also proposed that for those co-located LTCHs already subject to the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment at existing § 412.534, the policy expansion at § 412.536 would apply to payments under the LTCH PPS for patients discharged from co-located LTCHs (HwHs and satellites) that were admitted from referral sources *other* than their host hospital(s).

Therefore, under the proposed policy, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, a subclause (I) LTCH or LTCH satellite that discharges more than 25 percent (or applicable percentage) of Medicare patients admitted from *any* individual referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH. (that had not already reached outlier status, as discussed above) would be subject to the payment adjustment at § 412.536 for Medicare discharges from that hospital in excess of the applicable threshold. Furthermore, we believe that with the application of our proposed policy at § 412.536 to Medicare discharges from subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites that were admitted from any individual referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH., we are closing the ''location-specific loophole'' established by the implementation of § 412.534. The change would affect all LTCHs or LTCH satellite Medicare discharges that were

admitted from hospitals that are located on a different campus.

We proposed that the payment adjustment at § 412.534(h) for grandfathered LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities, discussed above in this section, would track the applicable provisions of the existing payment adjustment at § 412.534. Therefore, we proposed, at § 412.534(h), for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, the provisions of § 412.534 will also apply to grandfathered subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellite facilities. Accordingly, under revised § 412.534, if the percentage of the grandfathered LTCH or LTCH satellite's discharged Medicare inpatient population that were admitted from its co-located host exceeds the applicable percentage of the LTCH's Medicare discharges for that cost reporting period, an adjusted payment will be made for those discharges that were admitted from that hospital beyond the applicable percent threshold, at the lesser of the otherwise payable amount under 42 CFR part 412, subpart O or the amount payable under subpart O that would be equivalent to what Medicare would otherwise pay under the rules at subpart A, § 412.1(a). (The specifics of this payment formula are explained in considerable detail in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27879).) Furthermore, as with our initial payment adjustment at § 412.534, we proposed additional adjustments for LTCHs and LTCH satellites that would be affected by the new regulations and that are located in rural areas, or that admit Medicare patients from urban single or MSA-dominant referring hospitals (discussed below).

We did not propose extending the payment adjustment in § 412.534(h) and § 412.536 to those LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities that we refer to as subclause (II) LTCHs and LTCH satellites, established by section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act. The policy for subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites would be based on a calculation of the percentage of Medicare discharges that a LTCH admits from an individual hospital during a cost reporting period as compared to the LTCH's total Medicare discharges during that cost reporting period. Because of a significant policy distinction that we made at the start of the LTCH PPS for FY 2003, at this time we do not believe that this policy should be applied to subclause (II) LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities. With the implementation of the LTCH PPS, we revised the § 412.23(e)(2)(i) and (e)(3)(i) to calculate the ALOS based solely on Medicare patients who required long-stay hospitalizations at subclause (I) LTCHs defined by section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(I) of the Act; however, we did not change the formula for calculating the ALOS for a LTCH governed by section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act, implemented at § 412.23(e)(2)(ii), for a ''subclause (II)'' LTCH. We believed that in establishing a ''subclause (II)'' LTCH, the Congress provided an exception to the general definition of LTCHs under subclause (I). We had no reason to believe that the change in methodology for determining the average inpatient LOS would better identify the hospitals that the Congress intended to exclude under subclause (II) (67 FR 55974). Similarly, when we established the existing 25 percent or applicable percentage payment adjustment at § 412.534, we determined that its application to subclause (II) LTCHs was inappropriate because the designation of a subclause (II) LTCH was not solely dependent upon Medicare discharges (69 FR 49205). Therefore, we are not applying the expansion of the 25 percent policy at § 412.536 and amended § 412.534 to LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities defined under section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act. The existing and amended payment threshold adjustments at § 412.534 and at § 412.536 for subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites are based solely on percentages of LTCH Medicare discharges. As stated above in this section, we continue to believe that since we include both Medicare and non-Medicare discharges in our calculations for defining a subclause (II) LTCH at § 412.23(e)(2)(ii) that applying a payment adjustment that is based solely on Medicare discharges may not be appropriate. Furthermore, consistent with our policy not to include satellites of subclause (II) LTCHs which were specifically grandfathered at § 412.22(h)(3)(ii) in § 412.536, we have excluded subclause (II) LTCH satellites in the application of the 25 percent payment adjustment for co-located grandfathered LTCHs at § 412.534(h).

We received 270 comments on the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule. Several of these comments pertained to the extension of the expansion of the 25 percent rule to certain situations not currently covered under existing § 412.534. The following is a summary of these comments and our responses.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about the President's budget that has submitted to the Congress the savings to be affected by this proposed rule are already ''scored'' and claimed as savings. In light of this, the commenter questioned the legitimacy of the comment process.

Response: We disagree with the commenter that the inclusion of anticipated savings from the LTCH PPS in the President's Budget invalidates the legitimacy of notice and comment rulemaking. Projections for expenditures and savings are a necessary and expected step in the budgetary process for the Federal Government. The budget only represents the President's expectations or projections of what may happen in the future. It may make assumptions as to policies that have been proposed (or are being evaluated for this purpose) as a representation of will happen. But at most, the Budget should not be viewed as a final blueprint because the Administration cannot anticipate policy modifications in response to public comments. We fully consider all comments received during the comment period and modify proposed policies in response to public comment. Furthermore, we would urge the commenter to review the last several years of LTCH PPS and IPPS proposed and final rules and focus on the differences between the policies that we proposed and those that we finalized (for example, the interrupted stay policy (67 FR 13416, 13455 through 13462, and 67 FR 55954, 56003 through 56006); qualifications for LTCH HwH status (69 FR 23306, 28323 through 28327, and 69 FR 48916, 49191 through 49214); and revisions in the grandfathering of HwHs and satellites (71 FR 23996, 24124 through 24126 and 71 FR 47870, 48106 through 48117)) in order to more clearly appreciate the impact that comments have on the development of our final policies.

Comment: Several commenters questioned our authority in proposing a payment adjustment for LTCHs that is based on an IPPS payment. These commenters assert that the Congress excluded LTCHs from the IPPS in 1983 and enacted legislation that mandated a separate PPS for LTCHs that specifically required that payments to LTCHs should reflect the resource use and costs of treating LTCH patients. The commenters believe we are violating the statutory requirement that payments to LTCHs be on a per discharge basis ''that reflects the reasonable and necessary cost of providing services in a hospital having an average LOS of greater than 25 days.'' The commenters assert that a payment ''equivalent to'' or ''comparable to'' payments under the IPPS are actually payments under the IPPS, violating Congressional intent. Several commenters acknowledge our belief that the IPPS-equivalent is not a

payment under the IPPS but the ''thrust of the rationale'' for imposing the rule is that these cases still belong in the acute care hospital and payment should mirror payment under the IPPS. One commenter stated that the Congress ''established LTCHs as a distinct and separate level of care.''

Several commenters believe we are violating section 1801 of the Act (''Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal Officer or employee to exercise supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided'') and section 1802(a) of the Act (''Any individual entitled to insurance benefits under [Medicare] * * * may obtain health services from any institution, agency, or person qualified to participate * * * [in the Medicare program] if such institution, agency, or person undertakes to provide him such services''). These commenters stated that we have no authority to pay for services provided at a LTCH under the IPPS. Statutory authority for the establishment of the LTCH PPS indicates the Congress believed that LTCH care is more costly than acute because it requires the Secretary ''to account for different resource use of LTCH patients.'' The commenters believe that the policies in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule would strip away the special status given by the Congress to LTCHs, thus undermining the purpose of the LTCH PPS because a significant portion of payments would be reimbursed under the IPPS.

Response: Following further data and policy analysis, we believe that the policies that we are finalizing in this rule fairly address circumstances that we have become aware of as the LTCH PPS matures. We do not believe that we violated Congressional intent in either the BBRA of 1999 or the BIPA of 2000 in establishing a payment adjustment under the LTCH PPS that addresses our concerns about paying for a substantial number of short stay patients, particularly those with extremely short stays, under a payment system designed to treat long stay patients.

As indicated previously, section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA, confers broad discretionary authority on the Secretary to implement a PPS for LTCHs, including providing for appropriate adjustments to the payment system. This broad authority gives the Secretary great flexibility to fashion a LTCH PPS based on both original policies, as well as concepts borrowed from other payment systems that are adapted, where appropriate, to the LTCH context. In the instant case, our finalized policy utilizes, in large part, principles from the IPPS payment methodology and builds upon those concepts to create a LTCH PPS payment adjustment that results in an appropriate payment under the LTCH PPS for those inpatient stays that we believe could be more appropriately treated in another setting.

We disagree with commenters that our proposed expansion of the 25 percent policy that provides for a payment based on an ''IPPS comparable payment amount'' is a payment under the IPPS. We want to emphasize that such a payment is not an IPPS payment, but rather, given the fact that these patients are comparable to patients treated in acute care hospitals and that the statute precludes the existence of LTCH units, it is an appropriate payment adjustment under the LTCH PPS that is equivalent to a payment that would be derived from the IPPS payment methodology. Moreover, the authority extended to the Secretary by the BIPA included the discretion to ''provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term hospital payment system.'' Our final policy is one such adjustment made within the authority conferred under the statute. From the inception of the LTCH PPS for FY 2003, we have interpreted the above cited statutory provision to authorize the establishment of payment adjustment policies including short stay outliers (§ 412.529), interrupted stays (§ 412.531), and discharges from LTCHs. We also believe that the authority extended to the Secretary by the BIPA includes the discretion to develop a payment adjustment based upon establishing a percentage threshold for LTCH discharges that we believe are comparable to discharges from acute care hospitals under circumstances where we believe that a full episode of care has not been delivered at the referring hospital and that the LTCH is functioning like a step-down unit of the referring hospital.

We believe that further refining the 25 percent policy actually captures Congressional intent since it addresses the situation of a LTCH which by all appearances is serving as a unit of another hospital.

Comment: Some commenters maintain that we have no authority to restrict admissions through payment reductions to LTCHs that have no relationship to the referring acute care hospitals. One commenter stated that in proposing the extension of the 25 percent policy to non-co-located LTCHs, we have violated the Court's two-prong test for validity of a regulation established under *Chevron U.S.A., Inc.* v. *Natural Resources Defense Counsel, Inc.,* 467 U.S. 837, 842–843 (1984). Under the ruling, the Court asks whether the Congress addressed, in clear language, the issue in question and, if the answer is affirmative, the effect is given to the ''unambiguously expressed intent of Congress.'' If the ''statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue,'' ''the Agency's interpretation is allowed to stand as long as it is based on a permissible construction of the statute.'' *Id.* at 843. Deference to the Agency's interpretation is ''only appropriate when the agency has exercised its own judgment'' and is not based upon an erroneous view of the law. *Id.*

Response: We disagree that we have imposed criteria that would restrict admissions through payment reductions to LTCHs that have no relationship to the referring acute care hospitals. The payment adjustment we are implementing is not the equivalent to setting ''admissions criteria'' for treatment at a LTCH. An LTCH may admit as many hospital-level patients as it can safely treat and from whatever source(s) it chooses. However, we believe that LTCHs that discharge greater than the applicable percentage of patients admitted from a particular source that had not reached high cost outlier status, may be understood to be functioning similarly to a co-located LTCH (HwH or satellite), and therefore, more like a step-down unit of the acute care hospital. Under such a circumstance, we believe that the Medicare program would be generating a second payment under the LTCH PPS for a single episode of care for patient who, had not completed his or her episode of care and, is discharged to a LTCH for the remaining portion of the original episode of care. Thus, we believe that it is appropriate to adjust the payment to be made to the LTCH under the LTCH PPS.

Section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307 (b) of the BIPA, confers upon the Secretary tremendous discretion in creating the LTCH PPS. We believe that the expansion of the 25 percent policy is in accordance with the authority granted to the Secretary under 123 of the BBRA as amended by section 307 of the BIPA to make adjustments under the LTCH PPS and is consistent with the statute which precludes the establishment of LTCH units at section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act and is also consistent with the Secretary's authority under sections 1102 and 1871 of the Act. Therefore, we disagree with commenters that the Secretary is acting in contradiction of the statute and inconsistently with the Chevron doctrine.

As a result of our monitoring efforts, we have become increasingly aware that the intent of our existing payment adjustment policy at § 412.534 aimed at combating LTCHs functioning as long-stay ''units'' of the referring hospitals is being circumvented by creative patient-shifting and admission practices, in addition to, a spiked increase in the number of freestanding LTCHs. We have been monitoring the patient shifting patterns of LTCHs and referring hospitals that are not co-located with one another and have detected behavior that is not significantly different from that of co-located LTCHs and their host hospitals. Therefore, we do not believe that co-location is a prerequisite to inappropriate patient-shifting between an acute care hospital and a LTCH.

We believe that the danger of LTCHs functioning as ''units'' appears to be occurring not only in LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites, but also with freestanding LTCHs, and that in many cases, these non-co-located LTCHs and their referral sources may be functioning in ways that appear to have erased the line of ''functional separateness'' between these LTCHs and their referring acute care hospitals. If patient-shifting between the referring hospital and a LTCH exceeds a specific threshold prior to the patient reaching outlier status at the referring hospital (that is, prior to receiving a full episode of care) the LTCH appears to be functioning as a *de facto* step down unit of the acute care hospital, a configuration not permitted by section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act, which authorizes rehabilitation and psychiatric units but not LTCH units of acute care hospitals. We believe that if the patient is in effect, being treated in a ''unit'' of the acute care hospital, it is reasonable to revise the payment methodology and take this into account.

Comment: We received several comments supporting our inclusion of grandfathered LTCH HwHs in the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment. These commenters stated that such inclusion would ''level the playing field'' among LTCHs. A number of commenters disagreed with applying the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment for co-located LTCH HwHs and satellites. Other commenters urged us to ''continue the grandfathering exemption.'' Several commenters stated that including grandfathered LTCH HwHs with other LTCHs ''evades the Congressional mandate for grandfathering'' and also contradicts regulatory statements that we have made since the start of the LTCH PPS. One commenter stated that grandfathered LTCHs HwHs have ''operated in reasonable reliance on CMS statements that it [would] not apply the HwH requirements to [grandfathered LTCHs]'' and requested that we continue to exempt grandfathered LTCHs from the proposed 25 percent rule. The commenter noted that since grandfathered LTCH HwHs were exempt from the original 25 percent policy that had been codified at § 412.22(e)(5)(iii) and since § 412.534 is based on that requirement, we should continue to exempt grandfathered LTCH HwHs from this policy. One commenter noted that grandfathered LTCH HwHs were protected against being paid under the IPPS even though they did not comply with the ''separateness and control'' regulations but if they are required to comply with the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment, the ''result will be the same'' because the grandfathered LTCH HwH would be paid under the IPPS. Another commenter cited that LTCH HwHs are precluded from growing under our regulations, and therefore, they should be exempted from the 25 percent policy. One commenter agreed that HwH, freestanding, and grandfathered LTCHs should be subject to the extension of the 25 percent threshold rule, but believes that the threshold should be 35 percent for this group of LTCHs instead of 25 percent because it would still allow CMS to achieve its stated goal and would also be more realistic for LTCH providers that operate in small urban markets which are very similar to rural areas.

Response: We appreciate those commenters who endorsed our inclusion of grandfathered LTCH HwHs in the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment. (We would also note that satellites of LTCHs at § 412.22(h)(4) will also be affected by the policy change.) The payment adjustment that we are finalizing, will affect all subpart (I) LTCHs, including those LTCHs and LTCH HwHs and satellites that were already regulated under § 412.534 for discharges that had been admitted from their co-located hosts. It addresses our concern regarding Medicare patients who are discharged from referring hospitals prior to the delivery of a full episode of care, to LTCHs. In keeping with our fiduciary responsibility to protect the Medicare program against duplicative and inappropriate payments, we are finalizing the proposed policy at § 412.534(h) under which all subclause (I) LTCHs, including grandfathered LTCH HwHs and satellites, will be subject to the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment with regard to Medicare discharges that they admit from their co-located host. (We are also providing for conforming changes to § 412.534(a), (c)(1), (c)(2), (d)(1), and (e)(1) to include grandfathered HwHs and satellites, in existing provisions.) Furthermore, under new § 412.536, Medicare discharges from grandfathered LTCH HwHs and satellites that were admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH that exceed the applicable threshold, will be subject to the payment adjustment described in detail above in this section. (Elsewhere in these responses, we discuss the 3-year transition period to the full threshold adjustment that we are also providing for all LTCHs and LTCH satellites including grandfathered LTCHs and satellites affected under § 412.536.)

We disagree with commenters who stated that we are ''evading Congress' mandate, and contradicting regulatory statements that we have formerly made.'' Section 4417(a) of the BBA of 1997 amended 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act to provide that ''[a] hospital that was classified by the Secretary on or before September 30, 1995 as a hospital described in clause (iv) [a LTCH] shall continue to be so classified notwithstanding that it is located in the same building as or on the same campus as another hospital.'' We believe this provision was intended to prevent grandfathered LTCHs that were unable to satisfy our HwH regulations from losing their LTCH status. By finalizing the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold policy to include grandfathered LTCHs HwHs, in no way are we countermanding their exemption from the separateness and control regulations at § 412.22(e). LTCHs that exceed the applicable threshold do not lose their LTCH status. Rather, the new policy only affects the payment level for all LTCHs that exceed the threshold. We further believe that including grandfathered LTCH HwHs (and satellites) within the scope of the percentage payment threshold that we have established to ensure that Medicare is not generating two full payments one under the IPPS and another under the LTCH PPS for one episode of care, is well within the authority of section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA, which confers broad discretionary authority on the Secretary to develop and implement a PPS for LTCHs and further provides that the Secretary ''may provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term hospital payment system.''

We do not believe that it is reasonable to assume that by creating a limited

exception for these hospitals that the Congress intended to immunize these facilities from any further regulation by the Secretary as to their growth and financial impact on the Medicare program. ''We do not believe Congress was establishing a separate class of providers'' (71 FR 48109). Grandfathered LTCHs and LTCH satellite facilities are paid under the LTCH PPS and the revised payment adjustment under § 412.534 and new § 412.536 is merely another feature of the LTCH PPS.

One commenter believes we contradicted our own statements by including a partial quote from the FY 2007 IPPS final rule about grandfathered LTCH HwHs' ''reasonable reliance'' on the fact that we would not apply the HwH requirements. In that final rule, we explained that ''[t]he purposes of our grandfathering certain existing HwHs and satellites was to reflect reliance interests and settled expectations that existed on the part of these facilities at the time the separateness and control requirements were created'' (71 FR 48107). We believe this statement is consistent with our belief that including grandfathered HwHs in the extension of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold policy does not violate the Congress' intent. The expansion of the 25 percent policy will not affect the ''reliance interests and settled expectations'' of grandfathered HwHs (and also on LTCH satellites) since they will continue to be exempt from meeting the separateness and control requirements that are required by non-grandfathered co-located LTCHs. Moreover, the concerns that we hold regarding premature patient shifting from host hospitals or referring hospitals to LTCHs and the consequences of such patterns for Medicare payment purpose, may even be more relevant with regards to grandfathered LTCH HwHs because since they are exempted from the separateness and control policies they may even more closely resemble step-down units of their host hospitals.

Several commenters noted that the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment originated as one of the three options (the 75/25 test) with which HwHs could comply to meet the separateness and control requirements at (then) § 412.22(e)(v)(C). They stated that since grandfathered LTCH HwHs were exempted from this requirement when it was a ''certification issue,'' or ''control requirement,'' these facilities should similarly be exempted from the policy when it is a payment adjustment. We note that even though the percentages in these policies are the same, there is a critical difference between them. Because the effect of section 1886(d)(1)(B) is that grandfathered LTCH HwHs may continue to be classified as LTCHs even if they fail to meet with the ''separateness and control'' requirements that we had established at § 412.22(e), among which was the 75/25 test as one of the three options for indicating independent ''performance of basic hospital functions'' between the host and the LTCH HwHs, grandfathered HwHs continued to be excluded from the IPPS despite their unquestioned organizational and functional linkage to their host hospitals. A non-grandfathered LTCH HwH that was not in compliance with the separateness and control requirements would have lost its IPPS exclusion. Therefore, since loss of IPPS-excluded status is not a feature of the payment adjustments that we are finalizing at revised § 412.534 and § 412.536, we would disagree with the commenter that the ''result will be the same because the grandfathered LTCH HwH would be paid under the IPPS.'' Under § 412.534(h), which makes grandfathered LTCH HwHs (and LTCH satellites) subject to revised § 412.534(h) and to § 412.536, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, there is no risk of losing IPPS-excluded status. Grandfathered LTCHs would continue to be paid under the LTCH PPS, albeit, an adjusted payment amount, even if they exceed the applicable percentage threshold under our finalized policy.

As with all other subclause (I) LTCHs, Medicare payments to grandfathered LTCH HwHs (and satellites) for discharges in excess of the applicable threshold that were admitted from an individual referring hospital will be based on a payment under the LTCH PPS at the lesser of the otherwise unadjusted amount under the LTCH PPS or a payment equivalent to what would otherwise have been paid under the IPPS. As with *all* LTCHs and LTCH satellites that are subject to this payment policy, discharges that exceed the applicable threshold that had reached outlier status at the referring (or host) hospital, will not be subject to the payment adjustment and will therefore be eligible for otherwise unadjusted payment under subpart O.

Since we are applying the 25 percent policy even to freestanding LTCHs, it would be inconceivable to treat grandfathered HwHs as being in a unique class that exempts them from the policy while applying the policy to LTCHs that are totally separate from the referring hospital. We believe that the Congress intended to allow grandfathered HwHs to maintain their LTCH status but in no way intended for this group of LTCHs to receive an exclusion from payment policies applicable to freestanding LTCHs.

We further disagree with the commenters that since grandfathered LTCH HwHs (and satellites) are precluded from ''growth'' under our existing regulations, that they should not be subject to the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment. We have allowed grandfathered LTCH HwHs and satellites to modernize their facilities as necessary and appropriate even if modernization required an increase in square footage. Specifically, in the FY 2007 IPPS final rule, we revisited previous policies that limited grandfathered LTCH HwHs (and satellite facilities, including satellite units) from changing the ''terms and conditions'' under which they operated at the time of their grandfathering and we revised § 412.22((f)(3) (and § 412.22(h)(4) for satellites), and finalized a policy which would allow them to increase or decrease their square footage or decrease their number of beds without risking their grandfathered status. In that same final rule, we revised this policy for all HwHs, satellites, and satellite units of all excluded hospitals, not only LTCHs, because we were persuaded by comments received on our FY 2007 IPPS proposed rule (71 FR 23996) that these facilities needed to be able to expand in order to modernize (for example, to accommodate new medical equipment, record requirements, and new Federal, State, and local safety requirements). However, we did not allow grandfathered facilities to increase their number of beds because we believed that all grandfathered co-located facilities already held a significant advantage over such facilities that were not grandfathered, because they were not required to comply with separateness and control rules. Therefore, we believed that not only would allowing them to increase their bed count convey an additional unfair advantage to these facilities, but also that such an increase would lead to additional costs for the Medicare program (71 FR 48106 through 48115). We similarly believe that continued exemption of grandfathered LTCH HwHs and satellites from the payment threshold adjustment to which all other subclause (I) LTCHs are subject is both fair and appropriate, and in the words of our commenter, helps to ''level the playing field'' among LTCHs.

Regarding the commenter's suggestion that even as we extend the 25 percent

threshold payment adjustment to all LTCHs including grandfathered HwHs, we should raise the threshold to 35 percent as a more reasonable goal, particularly for small urban and rural areas, we would call the commenter's attention to the 3-year transition to the full threshold adjustment that we are providing (described in greater detail in the next response) which establishes a 75 percent threshold but not to exceed the percentage in the base year at § 412.536(f)(1) for all impacted LTCHs and LTCH satellites for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008 and a 50 percent but not to exceed the percentage in the base year threshold for all impacted LTCHs and LTCH satellites for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009, the threshold will be 25 percent (or the applicable percentage.) We have responded to comments regarding single urban and rural LTCHs elsewhere in these responses. We believe that establishing this policy will result in hospitalized patients who continue to need acute care hospital treatment to not be shifted to another acute care hospital setting before the end of a full episode of care, but rather to complete appropriate treatment at the referring hospital.

Comment: Several commenters contend that the relationship between a referring hospital and a freestanding LTCH should not be subject to the same regulatory standards as should a co-located LTCH and its host hospital. Furthermore, the commenters assert that when we finalized the 25 percent payment threshold for co-located hospitals, we provided a 4–year phase-in to the full 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold but in our proposed rule, we have not proposed any such phase-in for those LTCHs who would be affected under the proposed policy at proposed § 412.536. The commenters request that if we finalized the proposed extension of the 25 percent payment adjustment to non-co-located LTCHs and LTCH satellites, that we provide a similar transition period to allow LTCHs the opportunity to adapt to the full impact of the policy. In addition, commenters requested that we also provide for implementation on a site-specific basis, as we had under the existing § 412.534 provision rather than based on admissions to the provider in its entirety. One commenter stated that for purposes of implementation, using a provider number definition on the LTCH side would be simpler to track and control and would be less subject to manipulation.

Response: We have expressed our concerns regarding patient-shifting between host hospitals and co-located LTCHs (HwHs and satellites) since we originally established the separateness and control requirements at § 412.22(e) for FY 2005 (59 FR 45389 through 45393). Upon finalizing the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold policy for co-located LTCHs for FY 2005, we received comments indicating that we should be aware of similar patient shifting patterns between non-co-located LTCHs and their primary referring hospitals (69 FR 49211). Specifically, MedPAC noted that ''freestanding LTCHs also have strong relationships with acute care hospitals, and that where on average LTCH HwHs receive 61 percent of their patients from their hosts, freestanding LTCHs receive 42 percent from their a primary referring hospital * * * [that] there are some risks in our proposed 25 percent policy; (a) the 25 percent rule that only applies to LTCH HwHs and not to freestanding LTCHs and may therefore be inequitable; (b) it does not ensure that patients go to the most appropriate post-acute setting; (c) this approach may be circumvented by an increase in the number of freestanding LTCHs instead of LTCH HwH.'' As we stated in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, we believe that ''MedPAC shares our concern that the LTCH payment system creates an incentive for unbundling of the IPPS in addition to overpayment for the care provided by LTCHs and that this concern is great, particularly, in the case of a LTCH HwH * * * '' (69 FR 49211). We also provided an in-depth discussion of our growing concerns in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27874 through 27881). As we have stated, when we evaluate patient discharges from a host or a referring hospital (typically, an acute care hospital) and admission to a LTCH, we are particularly concerned that the acute care hospital has not provided a full episode of care for a patient who continues to need hospitalization, but instead, is discharging this patient to another acute care hospital, one that is paid under the LTCH PPS. Consequently, two Medicare claims are submitted; one from the acute care hospital and the other for payment under the LTCH PPS for what was essentially one episode of care.

In this final rule, while we continue to believe that the expansion of the 25 percent payment threshold policy for at § 412.536 and revised § 412.534 are appropriate, in response to the commenters, we have revisited our original proposal and will provide for a 3-year phase-in of the final payment threshold adjustment at § 412.536 and revised § 412.534. Specifically, in this final rule, we have established a 3-year transition period under § 412.536 for LTCHs that will be governed by the expansion of the 25 percent threshold policy for LTCH discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH and also for those grandfathered co-located LTCHs that we included under this policy at revised § 412.534(h).

Under the policy that we are finalizing for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007 and before July 1, 2008, the threshold will be no less than the lesser of 75 percent or the percentage that the LTCH or LTCH satellite discharged from the referring hospital during its RY 2005 cost reporting period. For cost reporting periods on or after July 1, 2008 and before July 1, 2009, the threshold will be no less than the lesser of 50 percent or the percentage that the LTCH or LTCH satellite discharged from the referring hospital, during its RY 2005 cost reporting period. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009, all LTCHs and LTCH satellites under § 412.536 and grandfathered LTCHs and LTCH satellites under § 412.534 will be subject to the applicable percentage threshold. (We note that for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2007, non-grandfathered co-located subclause (I) LTCHs, under § 412.534, are fully phased-in to the full 25 percent (or applicable percentage threshold) for discharges admitted from their co-located hosts. However, payments for LTCH discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, are governed under § 412.536.)

Furthermore, under our finalized policy, grandfathered LTCH HwHs and satellites, under § 412.534(h) and § 412.536 will now be subject to the 3-year transition that we are finalizing under this new policy for *all* their discharges, both admitted from their co-located host and from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH hospital.

We believe that a 3-year transition is sufficient time for those affected LTCHs to adapt to this payment adjustment. Since the implementation of the existing payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534 for FY 2005, we have clearly articulated our continuing concerns about patient-shifting between non-co-located LTCHs and referring hospitals (69 FR 49213, 71 FR 27878 through 27879). Therefore, we believe

that we have provided ample notice to the LTCH industry of potential impending regulation in this area and that therefore we believe that the industry had time to adjust its behavior. We have also seen articles in trade association newsletters over the past several years indicating that the LTCH industry was well aware of our focus on this issue. However, in response to comments, we have adopted a 3-year transition policy that we believe will provide additional time for LTCHs to adjust to the new regulations.

However, we also want to reiterate, that just as we provided under § 412.534, the payment adjustment specified at § 412.536 will not be applied to discharges (admitted to LTCHs or LTCH satellites from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH) that reached HCO status at the referring hospital prior to admission to the LTCH or LTCH satellite.

Regarding implementation of the new payment adjustments, we will be implementing the percentage threshold at § 412.536 on the provider as a whole for multi-campus referring sources and also for multi-campus LTCHs or LTCH satellites in contrast to our location-specific implementation of the 25 percent payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs under § 412.534. We agree with the commenter that location-specific implementation was consistent with our policy goals in addressing patient movement between co-located LTCHs and LTCH satellites and their hosts. However, we believe that our goals regarding LTCH discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH are more logically served by basing implementation on the provider as a whole (that is, based on discharge data for the entire provider under its provider number). Discharges from a co-located LTCH or LTCH satellite that were admitted from remote locations of the host hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH would also be held to the expanded 25 percent policy by aggregating the discharges from those locations and determining if they exceeded the applicable threshold. Patients that are admitted from the hospital that is co-located with the LTCH or LTCH satellite facility will continue to be governed by the location-specific implementation of § 412.534.

We have revised our proposed policy regarding transitioning to the full 25 percent threshold adjustment and under our finalized policy, for all subclause (I) co-located HwHs and satellites, including grandfathered subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites under the extension of the 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) threshold policy that we are finalizing, at revised § 412.534(h) and § 412.536, and we are providing for a 3-year transition period. Accordingly, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, and before July 1, 2008, the percentage threshold applied would be no less than the lesser of 75 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted from all referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH during that cost reporting period or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted to the LTCH or LTCH satellite from that referring hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period. Although we proposed to use FY 2005 as the base year for this group of LTCHs in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4815), we will use RY 2005 rather than FY 2005 as the base year since we have revised the transition period under § 412.536 to be effective and applicable for cost reporting periods on a rate year cycle (That is, beginning on or after July 1. We originally chose 2005 because when we published our proposed rule, FY 2005 was our most recent full year of MedPAR data. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2008 and before July 1, 2009, the percentage threshold applied would be no less than the lesser of 50 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted from all referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH during that cost reporting period or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted to the LTCH or LTCH satellite from that referring hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009, the threshold will be 25 percent (or the applicable percentage.) A 3-year transition period is applicable for all subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites governed under § 412.536 and to grandfathered LTCHs and LTCH satellites now subject to the threshold under § 412.534. For co-located LTCHs (that is, LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites) it is important to note that under existing § 412.534(g)(4), for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2007, LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites being phased-in to the full adjustment would enter year 4 and be would be required to meet the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold regarding their percentage of discharges from their co-located hosts. However, these LTCH HwHs or LTCH satellites are governed by § 412.536 regarding discharges that they admitted from any *other* referral source (that is, other than its co-located host hospital) and would be subject to the 3-year transition beginning with cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007.

We also believe that it is important that we note that the 3-year transition to the full 25 percent threshold payment adjustment will coincide with our continuing work on the MedPAC recommendations to attempt to develop facility and patient level criteria for LTCHs. We hope that the LTCH industry will work closely with CMS to pursue this endeavor during the transition period.

Comment: Several commenters maintained that we did not present convincing data-based evidence in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule and that in the absence of meaningful data no meaningful comments can be made. Several commenters questioned why we are seeking to expand the 25 percent threshold policy to non-co-located LTCHs when we have not yet evaluated data from the FY 2005 implementation of the same payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs and LTCH satellites. Some commenters included data analyses that they believe refutes the policies that we proposed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule. The commenters urged CMS to review the most current hard data from LTCHs and to base all policy formulations on the conclusions that can reasonably be drawn from such data. Several commenters contended that we proposed policy based on anecdotes rather than on hard data and that we have accused the LTCH industry based on this anecdotal evidence. The commenters requested that we provide data, rather than anecdotal evidence of the purported ''gaming'' that we believe is occurring between the acute hospitals and LTCHs. The commenters further contended that the research produced by RTI should be the foundation of future CMS rulemaking.

Commenters also maintained that rather than continuing to increase, the absolute number of LTCHs has decreased by one during 2006, and therefore, we should not continue to be concerned about industry growth.

Response: We disagree with the commenters' assertions regarding both our analyses and provision of the best available data evidence for the policies that we proposed and that this lack resulted in LTCH stakeholders being unable to submit ''meaningful comments.'' In fact, we received 270 comments in response to the RY 2008

LTCH PPS proposed rule (some of which were very lengthy). We believe that the concerns expressed in these comments, which we present in appropriate sections of this final rule by topic, are indicative that meaningful comments were made. In determining our final policy, we are fully aware of the serious attention that our commenters invested in their policy recommendations, as well as in the challenges that they have articulated presented. Moreover, regarding assertions that we have not provided data that indicates our policy rationale, we note that in December 2006 we posted the RTI report in its entirety on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/LongTermCareHospitalPPS/02a_RTIReports.asp#TopOfPage*. This report contains detailed data analyses which were the bases of RTI's findings and significantly impacted our decisions to propose specific policies.

With regard to the data analyses that some commenters submitted challenging the correlation that we proffered, between the discharges to LTCHs and fewer high cost outlier cases at referring acute care hospitals we would assert that our data analyses (described below) support this theory.

An analysis of our MedPAR data from acute care hospitals regarding their LOS during CY 2003 to their LOS during CY 2005 in markets where LTCHs opened in CY 2004. Our data analysis focused on acute care hospitals that had been the source of at least 25 percent of the LTCH discharges. (Our data indicated that these communities already had some LTCHs at the time when these additional LTCHs opened.) We compared 304,650 acute care cases in CY 2004 to 316,816 cases in CY 2005. In CY 2003, there were 7,586 outliers and in CY 2005, there were 5,858. The percentage of outliers in the acute care hospitals decreased from 2.5 percent to 1.8 percent and the numbers of patients that were admitted to LTCHs in those communities increased from 2,128 in CY 2003 to 6,597 in CY 2005. Furthermore, the percentage of acute care hospital discharges to LTCHs increased from 0.7 percent in CY 2003 to 2.1 percent in CY 2005. The percentage decline in total outliers between the CY 2003 and CY 2005 was −25.7 percent. The increase in LTCH discharges from CY 2003 to CY 2005 was 198.1 percent.

We would also quote section 3.3 ''the RTI report which summarizes its detailed data analyses (which are included in the Report) by noting that LTCH admissions were less likely to have had an outlier payment during the prior acute stay (8 percent compared to 12 percent for non-LTCH admissions). The ALOS in the acute hospital [prior to discharge to the LTCH] tended to be longer for the LTCH admissions, averaging 13.5 days compared to only 11 days for the other acute admissions.'' (p. 51) This statement indicates that those patients that were admitted to the LTCH before achieving outlier status at the acute care hospital were ''sicker'' than other patients in those DRGs, which is logical since they continued to need acute hospital-level treatment. (Elsewhere in these responses, we respond, in greater detail, to comments that we received that challenge our benchmark assumption that reaching outlier status signifies the delivery of a full episode of care. To briefly summarize, it is our belief that a patient at an acute care hospital who still is in need of acute hospital-level care upon discharge from that setting, may not have completed the treatment for which the Medicare is paying) and is using the LTCH as a unit to treat those patients.

In particular, we suggest that commenters revisit Table 3–7 in the RTI Report which indicates that while most patients constituting LTCH admissions were previously hospitalized, only a small proportion of those in the acute hospital generated an outlier payment (less than 20 percent) except for the DRG 452: Complications of Treatment with CC (21.3 percent) and DRG 204: Disorders of the Pancreas Except Malignancy (26.2 percent). About one-fourth of the top 50 LTCH conditions had 15 to 20 percent of their admissions qualifying for an acute outlier payment before being admitted to the LTCH. These included many of the medically complex conditions such as: DRG 475: Ventilator Support 16.9 percent); DRG 316: Renal Failure (19.3 percent); DRG 076: Other Respiratory System OR Procedures with CC (19.2 percent); DRG 188: Other Digestive System (19.5 percent); DRG 483: Tracheostomy (17.8 percent); DRG 461: OR Procedures (17.8 percent); DRG 331: Other Kidney and Urinary Tract Diagnoses with CC (17.1 percent); and DRG 440: Wound Debridements for Injuries (19.4 percent). Still, the majority of LTCH admissions were admitted before reaching outlier status in the acute hospital'' (p. 48).

We believe that the above data supports our extension of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment which distinguishes between patients in need of further acute level care who were admitted to a LTCH or satellite after receiving a full episode of care at the referring acute (that is, they reached outlier status at that hospital) and those needing further acute treatment that were admitted to the LTCH following what appears to be a truncated stay at the acute care hospital.

In response to the comments that suggested that our extension of the 25 percent payment threshold policy was premature since as yet, we had no data on the impact of the 25 percent policy on co-located LTCHs, because the policy is not yet fully phased-in, we reiterate that regulating inappropriate patient shifting to LTCH HwHs and satellites from their co-located hosts does not negate the need to address the same issue between LTCHs and referring hospitals with which they are not co-located. We remain concerned about LTCHs with a pattern of patients who need acute hospital-level care after having received treatment for which Medicare has paid under the IPPS that are immediately admitted for additional hospital-level treatment to other acute care hospitals (LTCHs) for another Medicare payment under the LTCH PPS.

In response to commenters who found fault with our attention to anecdotal information regarding the behavior of some LTCHs, we note that determinations are based on our policy on a variety of factors, including information from our FIs, questions and comments from LTCH consultants and attorneys, LTCH advertisements in both print media and the internet that provided us with irrefutable information about LTCH behavior. We believe that it is our fiduciary responsibility to guard the Medicare Trust Fund from inappropriate and unnecessary expenditures. Therefore, we believe that any and all information regarding the LTCH industry is pertinent to our responsibility to be proactive in the regulatory process. For example, we are aware of a growing trend by some LTCHs to establish ''units dedicated to mental health,'' identified as a ''Mental Health Unit'' or ''Medical-Behavioral Unit.'' Assuming that the LTCH organization is cognizant of the preclusion against the establishment of excluded units (for example, psychiatric or rehabilitation) in a hospital that is excluded from the IPPS (see § 412.25((a)(1)(ii)) establishment of such titular ''units'' would be reimbursed by Medicare under the LTCH PPS. Clearly patients in any acute care hospital setting (and LTCHs are acute care hospitals) may need psychiatric intervention, but given our regulations governing excluded psychiatric units at § 412.27 and the specific COPs for psychiatric facilities at § 482.62, we are very interested in LTCHs that are advertising mental health care as a primary patient service.

Regarding the comments that note an absolute decrease in the number of LTCHs that were established in FY 2006, we note that we are well aware of continuing growth in the LTCH industry, which in some part, takes the form of large LTCH companies purchasing existing LTCHs and expanding the facilities, as well as the shifting landscape of the LTCH industry brought about by continuing corporate mergers. (Our information in this regard comes to us from FIs, corporate press releases from LTCHs, newsletters from LTCH trade associations, corporate Web sites, and investment newsletters. For example, one Web newsletter announced, ''Private Equity Firms Target Long-Term Acute Care Hospitals.'' The article continued, ''Two operators of long-term acute care hospitals, or LTACS, agreed to be bought by private equity firms, but for very different reasons. Two notable deals were announced this month targeting companies that manage long-term acute care hospitals, or LTACs. In both cases, leveraged buyout firms initiated transactions to buy out operators of multiple LTACs. The rationale for each, however, is different, reflecting different business plans and different stages in the growth cycles of the two companies.''

With respect to the commenter's suggestion that we have alluded to gaming of the Medicare program by the LTCH industry and that we have provided no substantiation for these beliefs, we would note that we have participated in meetings, conference calls, correspondence, evaluated currently-used patient criteria, arranged site visits with LTCHs (and other providers that treat ''long-term care hospital-type'' patients), and participated in the Technical Expert Panel (TEP) that was held in January 2007. While we have met and worked with highly skilled physicians and administrators of a number of LTCHs and we are aware that many LTCHs provide high quality services to their patients, we are contemporaneously aware of activity by the LTCHs that appear to be directed towards both evading the intent of Medicare policy and also maximizing Medicare payments.

We are also aware that the dynamic of patient shifting from acute care hospitals to LTCHs are well understood throughout the health care industry. In the February 28, 2000 issue of Critical Care Medicine, an abstract of an article entitled, ''The impact of long-term acute-care facilities on the outcome and cost of care for patients undergoing prolonged mechanical ventilation'' concluded that ''Patients undergoing prolonged ventilation have high hospital and 6-month mortality rates, and 6-month outcomes are not significantly different for those transferred to long-term acute care facilities * * *. Acute care hospitals can reduce the amount of uncompensated care by earlier transfer of appropriate patients to a long-term acute care facility.'' (Seneff MG, Wagner D, Thompson D, Honeycutt, C, Silver MR, Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, The George Washington University Medical Center).

Lastly, we note that we believe that the policies that we are finalizing in this final rule are built on solid data analysis, reasonable interpretation of information that has come to our attention from the TEPs and the LTCH industry, and our obligation to propose proactive policy initiatives for the long-term benefit of the Medicare program.

Comment: Several commenters offered data indicating that patients admitted to LTCHs following an acute care hospital stay are generally grouped into a different DRG at the LTCH from the one to which they were grouped in the acute care hospital. The commenter used the example of ventilator dependent patients, who typically fall into a tracheostomy DRG (561/562) upon discharge from the acute care hospital but fall under the respiratory failure DRG (475) upon discharge from the LTCH, suggesting that therefore the two episodes of care are distinct and separate. The commenters also claimed that even those patients with the same DRG in each setting do not constitute a single episode of care because of the nature of the institutions and the differences between them. Therefore, the commenters asserted, there can be no actual claim that there is double payment for the *same* services for LTCH patients coming from IPPS hospitals. In focusing on the appropriate lengths of stay at acute care hospitals preceding a LTCH admission, many commenters quoted the RTI study that notes that, ''Understanding whether acute hospitals are already paid for these services or whether LTCHs are providing specialized services not available in the acute hospitals is poorly understood'' (p. 55). The commenters believe that a CMS contractor has contradicted statements that we made. Therefore, the commenters state that the extension of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment to discharges of patients admitted from referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH should not be finalized. Several commenters suggested that if we did finalize this payment adjustment, it should be limited only to those situations where the same DRGs were assigned to both the acute care stay and the LTCH stay.

Response: Our data analysis of the 2005 MedPAR files indicates that, generally, when a patient is admitted to a LTCH immediately upon discharge from an acute care hospital, Medicare *is* paying for treatment under different DRGs for each submitted claim. However, we disagree with the commenters' assertions that there are clear distinctions between ''episodes of care'' for a patient who is originally treated at an acute care hospital and eventually admitted to a LTCH, whether or not the same DRG is assigned to each stay. Patients being cared for in both the acute care hospital and LTCH settings are very ill, complicated patients with multiple comorbidities, and typically there is not one clear or distinctive principle diagnosis that is the cause of the patient's failure to get well, but rather a constellation of problems that necessitate further treatment. Nor will one ''magic'' intervention or procedure necessarily cure the patient's problems. DRG assignment is based on software that attempts to group patients according to individual principal diagnoses and surgical procedures, but the clinical reality is that, especially in the case of complex patients with multiple medical problems, DRG assignment can be a limited way of defining or characterizing the nature of a particular episode of care for a given patient.

The example of respiratory failure that the commenter provides is especially illustrative of this point. A patient who suffers from respiratory failure in the acute care hospital, if it does not resolve, will eventually require a tracheostomy, which will then group the patient to the tracheostomy DRG. The tracheostomy itself is a procedure that is usually done on a semi-elective basis when it becomes apparent that the patient will require prolonged mechanical ventilation. If that patient subsequently is admitted to an LTCH, that discharge will necessarily group to the respiratory failure DRG, because the tracheostomy has already been performed during the acute care hospitalization. However, the clinical characteristics of the patient and the type of care that is required, have not materially changed, and the LTCH stay can hardly be viewed as a separate or unique clinical episode from the immediately preceding acute care hospital stay. From a clinical perspective, in the absence of a sharp line of distinction, or a consistent characterization, of exactly which

patient is appropriate for admission to the LTCH, as well as when that patient should be transferred from the acute care hospital setting to the LTCH setting, we have difficulty understanding when, for example, the patient with respiratory failure stops being appropriately cared for in the acute care hospital and paid for under the IPPS and begins to require care in the LTCH. Recognizing that both settings provide acute hospital level care, and also noting that in areas where LTCHs are not available this level of care is provided exclusively in the acute care hospital until the time of discharge to a nonacute setting, it is therefore appropriate to expand the 25 percent policy to all instances in which a referring hospital is discharging so many patients to the LTCH or satellite that it appears to have created a virtual unit of the referring hospital at the LTCH or LTCH satellite.

To those commenters who quoted a sentence (out of context) from the RTI report, we note that a thorough reading of that page indicates that RTI's purpose does not contradict, but rather reinforces the above stated concerns. RTI's full intent may be best understood from the following paragraphs, which includes the quoted sentence:

''Examining the acute length of stay differences was also useful for understanding the relative role of general acute and LTCHs in treating these severely ill populations. The multivariate work showed that LTCH users have a shorter acute inpatient length of stay. Understanding whether acute hospitals are already paid for these services or whether LTCHs are providing specialized services not available in the acute hospital is poorly understood.

Better measures of acuity are needed to gauge the differences in medical or functional impairments between patients using LTCHs and those using other settings. Additional work in Phase 3 of this project will examine the discharge transitions for acute hospital discharges in areas that lack LTCHs. Using propensity score methods to match patients on diagnosis, severity, and additional factors, as well as control for differences in the availability of services will be important for understanding the potential overlap between acute and LTCH admissions.'' (p. 55)

Therefore, we continue to believe that clinical insight offers a significant challenge to the commenters' assertions regarding the alleged existence of some ''bright line'' which clearly indicates when it is no longer appropriate for a patient to continue treatment in an acute care hospital. Particularly in the case of patients whose conditions fall into the broad category of ''medically complex,'' clinicians from different provider settings from throughout the country have evaluated existing instruments (that is, Interqual, or MassPRO) and although there appears to be no difficulty in defining a ''hospital-level long-term care type patient'' there has been considerable difficulty in determining the assignment of such patients to particular provider settings (acute versus LTCH) for purposes of Medicare payment policy.

Accordingly, we are finalizing the extension of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold policy so that the payment adjustment applies to all subclause (I) LTCHs. We believe it is our responsibility to protect the Medicare Trust Fund from making excessive payments for a single episode of care.

Comment: Many commenters suggested alternatives to specific aspects of the proposed expansion of the proposed 25 percent threshold payment adjustment in the event that we decided to finalize it. A number of commenters suggested that we grandfather existing ''freestanding'' LTCHs from compliance with the policy because of the significant shift in operation that our policy would mean to their on-going operations. Similarly, these commenters also suggested grandfathering those LTCHs that were already under development (that is, hospitals that were in their 5 of 6 month qualification period for LTCH designation as set forth in § 412.23(e)(3)). Several commenters further suggested that we set a 50 percent threshold for all existing LTCHs and those under development and apply a 25 percent threshold for new LTCHs beginning on July 1, 2007. Other commenters asked us to set the percentage threshold permanently at 50 percent for non-co-located LTCHs in light of our ''lesser policy concerns'' than we have with LTCH HwHs and satellites. Several commenters urged us to set the threshold for LTCHs in ''underserved areas'' at 75 percent because of the disparate impact that could be anticipated from implementing this policy. Commenters suggested that we establish a 50 percent threshold for urban LTCHs and a 75 threshold for rural or market dominant LTCHs. We also were requested to apply ''temporary, limited'' expansion of the threshold while patient and facility level characteristics are being developed and implemented for LTCHs over a 3-year period with the following percentage thresholds: year 1–75 percent; year 2–62.5 percent; year 3–50 percent. According to the commenter, this policy would sunset after year 3 and be replaced by facility and patient criteria.

Response: We appreciate each of the recommendations made by the commenters as to alternatives to extending the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment policy to all subclause (I) LTCHs effective July 1, 2007. We have considered the commenters concerns as we noted earlier, we are finalizing the payment adjustment policy but (as describe elsewhere in these responses), we have provided for a 3-year transition period for all LTCHs and LTCH satellites that will be affected by these changes. Commenters suggested that we exempt currently existing and ''under development'' LTCHs from the policy because it would require a substantial change in the way that these facilities currently operate. In response to the commenter's question regarding ''under development'' LTCHs, we are applying the transition to these hospitals as applicable, once they become LTCHs (for example, if a hospital has its first cost reporting period as a LTCH beginning on July 1, 2008, it will be subject to the 50 percent threshold.) We are aware that these new regulations will impact on admission policies at LTCHs (as well as discharge practices at acute care hospitals for patients that continue to need hospital-level care) but such changes are our stated purpose in establishing the original 25 percent threshold payment adjustment policy for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534 and it continues to be our goal for all LTCHs and satellites as we finalize § 412.536. We believe that it is essential that LTCHs reevaluate their existing practices for admittances from referring hospitals. As specified elsewhere in these responses, our data indicates that referring hospitals, primarily acute care hospitals, are discharging patients to LTCHs for continued acute level care when many of these patients could continue to be treated in the acute care hospital. This is particularly true in cases where patient care falls into the broad category of ''medically complex.'' We believe that Medicare should not be generating two full payments, one under the IPPS and one under the LTCH PPS for what is essentially one episode of care. Although we have had historic concerns with patient-shifting between co-located hospitals, we also believe that it is appropriate to apply the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment to those LTCHs and LTCH satellites that had previously been unaffected by § 412.534, but have similar behavior patterns as co-located HwHs and satellites. (We have responded to concerns about rural, single urban, and

MSA dominant LTCHs elsewhere in these responses.) We would once again remind commenters that the payment adjustment is only applicable for Medicare discharges in excess of the applicable threshold from an individual referring hospital for cases that have *not* reached outlier status at the referring hospital. We believe that an appropriate and judicious admission policy, on the part each LTCH, could still enable it to admit a specific subset of patients from a referring hospital, prior to the patients' reaching outlier status, and prior to exceeding the applicable threshold. Therefore, even though we continue our work with RTI in Phase 3 of their project to see if we can identify appropriate patient and facility-level criteria for LTCHs, we do not see the development of those criteria and the development of those regulations as contradictory aspects of our fiduciary responsibility for the Medicare program. We further believe that it may be appropriate to establish policies under the LTCH PPS that guard the Medicare Trust Fund from duplicative payments for one episode of patient care even if we are able to develop criteria that identify LTCHs and LTCH-appropriate patients.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern that the proposed expansion of the 25 percent policy would have a negative impact on Medicare beneficiary access to care, physician choice and authority, and on families of patients who would benefit from LTCH care. Specifically, the commenters noted that LTCHs would be ''forced to use a flat 25 percent for each referring hospital, thereby limiting access for Medicare beneficiaries to the level of care deemed most appropriate by their physician.'' Another commenter stated that the implementation of the 25 percent rule would force acute care hospitals to keep patients beyond the period for which is medically-appropriate because LTCHs would not be able to accept patients once they met the 25 percent threshold and that overcrowding of acute hospital beds would be the result of the 25 percent policy. Another commenter stated that this policy may result in some patients being transferred to skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) instead of LTCHs, even in cases in which LTCH care would be more appropriate.

Response: We do not believe that the 25 percent policy is unnecessarily ''burdensome'' or ''onerous'' to LTCHs for several reasons. The 25 percent policy does not preclude the transfer of any patients from short term acute care hospitals to LTCHs when such transfer is deemed medically necessary and appropriate by the treating physician; rather, it adjusts the payment methodology that is applied to the LTCH for discharges that exceed the applicable threshold. Also, as we noted in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule, the payment policy linked to the 25 percent rule helps to remove the perverse incentive that may exist between acute care hospital and LTCH facilities to evade § 412.534 and to prevent both the acute and LTCH from receiving two full Medicare payments for what is essentially one episode of care. Furthermore, this policy also helps to ensure that appropriate transfers from acute to LTCH facilities are occurring based on medical considerations, rather than on the basis of maximizing Medicare payments. We believe that the preexisting relationship between LTCHs and their referring hospitals can be utilized to maximize quality patient care while also making it feasible for LTCHs to comply with the 25 percent policy.

With respect to the commenter's concern that the 25 percent policy would result in transfers to SNFs when LTCH care would be more appropriate, we note that since we are only dealing with patients who require hospital level of care, it would not be appropriate for physicians to transfer these patients to a SNF. However, we do note that it may be appropriate for a subset of LTCH patients, after their condition has stabilized to be transferred to a lower level of care, such as a SNF.

Comment: One commenter noted that Michigan is a ''certificate of need'' State and that the number of LTCH beds is determined and approved by the State. The commenter further noted that Michigan FIs require that Michigan LTCHs use InterQual admissions standards and recommends that we exempt States who have programs similar to the ''certificate of need'' because they already adhere to InterQual admissions standards, and therefore, are only treating appropriate ''LTCH'' patients.

Response: With respect to some LTCHs using InterQual criteria as the standard for admitting a patient, we note that as we stated in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule, InterQual standards focus on the distinction between acute care and sub-acute care, that is, SNF-level of care, and determinations of ''medical necessity'' or ''inappropriate admission'' are based only on whether the patient should be hospitalized, rather than on whether the hospitalization should occur at an LTCH or at a general acute care hospital'' (71 FR 27869). Furthermore, we recognize and assume that all LTCHs should be using some form of clinical assessment or screening tool to identify appropriate admission candidates; the InterQual is just one model of such a tool that LTCHs may choose to use if they determine that those standards sufficiently identify appropriate patients for their facility. However, we note that the choice of which screening tool an LTCH chooses to use should have no bearing on the percentage of patients being admitted from a particular referring hospital because even under the expansion of the 25 percent policy, it is assumed that all LTCH admissions are hospital-level patients. As explained previously in this section, the expansion of the 25 percent policy is intended to address the situation of an LTCH or satellite that is treating hospital-level patients since it has exceeded the applicable threshold for discharging patients that were admitted from any individual referring hospital and is serving as a unit of the referring hospital. Therefore, we are not exempting LTCHs in ''certificate of need'' States from the 25 percent policy, but again note that they, along with all other affected LTCH and LTCH satellites will be given a 3-year transition period with respect to implementation of this policy.

Comment: One commenter supported the proposed 25 percent rule and believes that the SSO provision should not apply to subclause II and satellite LTCHs.

Response: We are finalizing our proposal to exempt subclause II and satellite LTCHs from both the 25 percent rule expansion and the SSO policy that we are finalizing in this rule.

Comment: One commenter stated that implementation of the 25 percent rule would result in the following: (1) The loss of local LTCH services in all areas except large metropolitan areas; (2) Patients having to endure long ambulance rides to access LTCH care and possibly being driven past LTCHs with available beds; (3) Families having to drive longer distances to visit their loved ones who may be in LTCHs for extended periods of time; and (4) Some companies, who have already invested in building new LTCHs, possibly being faced with bankruptcy because of the reduced payment associated with the 25 percent rule.

Response: We disagree with the commenter and we do not expect that the 25 percent policy will result in a loss of local LTCH services (in all but large metropolitan areas). Instead, we expect that clinical appropriateness will continue to be used as the standard for LTCH admissions. Since we do not believe that access to LTCH services will be negatively affected by this rule,

we do not believe that beneficiaries will need to endure long ambulance rides to reach an LTCH, nor will families of Medicare beneficiaries have to drive long distances to visit their loved ones. We also remind the commenter that LTCHs will continue to be paid full LTC-DRG payments as long as the 25 percent threshold is not exceeded by any one referral source. In addition, any patients that reach HCO status prior to being transferred to the LTCH would not count towards the 25 percent policy. With regard to the commenter's concern about companies being faced with a financial loss in light of the 25 percent policy expansion, we note that we continue to believe that the LTCH industry can adapt their admission practices to assure that payments will not be reduced, except in rare circumstances. The LTCHs would do this by targeting those patients at referring hospitals that had reached outlier status.

Comment: Some commenters expressed concern that the proposed 25 percent rule would override physician authority and limit physician choice in deciding the most appropriate level of care for his or her patients.

Response: We disagree that this policy overrides physician authority and choice. Rather we believe that this policy appropriately adjusts payments to LTCHs so that the payments reflect the amount of care that is actually provided in the LTCH setting. Furthermore, this policy does not require a change in physician clinical decision-making; rather, it simply seeks to remove any financial incentive that could encourage an LTCH to admit a patient from an acute care hospital prior to that patient receiving a full episode of care at the acute care hospital. Additionally, we would expect that physicians would continue to use their clinical expertise in assessing the level and type of care that is most appropriate for their patients and that the physicians' clinical standards would not be affected by hospital payment policies.

We do not expect that the payment policies implemented in this final rule will deter physicians from making referrals to LTCHs when it is clinically appropriate to do so. We also believe that appropriate clinical care, not payment, should drive physicians' decisions with respect to patients' length of stay and level of care. Additionally, we note that physicians' clinical decisions do not negate the fact that payments should be aligned with the care and resource utilization given in each provider setting.

Comment: Several commenters stated that the payment reductions associated with the proposed 25 percent rule expansion and the proposed ''very SSO'' policy violate the principles of a PPS in which some cases are expected to cost less than others.

Response: We disagree that these policies violate the principles of averaging found in a PPS. We note that a fundamental premise of the PPS system is that where the costs of some cases may exceed their payment, the opposite is also likely to happen (that is that the costs of some cases will be lower than their payment). As we stated in last year's LTCH PPS final rule, ''* * * while some types of cases are always expensive for a hospital to treat, others are, in general, less costly, so it is assumed that hospitals under a DRG-based system, therefore, can typically exercise some influence over their case-mix and their services to achieve fiscal stability'' (71 FR 27863). The principles of a PPS begin to break down when there are extreme outliers that are not consistent with the averages calculated, especially when the extreme outliers constitute a disproportionate amount of cases. Additionally, we are attempting to maintain appropriate payment weights for the DRGs by adjusting the LTC–DRG weights for SSO cases. (For a full description of this process, see 71 FR 47978 through 47985). We note that the effect of this adjustment allows the LTC–DRGs to be recalibrated at a weight that is truly representative of average cases instead of at a weight that is skewed towards shorter than average (and presumably, less costly) cases. We also believe that applying the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment to discharges from LTCHs that were admitted from any referring hospital is not a contradiction of the averaging principle intrinsic to PPSs. In fact, one of our rationales for establishing the percentage threshold payment adjustment is to preserve the integrity of the averaging principle under the IPPS because of our concern regarding premature discharges of patients still requiring acute hospital-level care to another acute care provider (and generating another Medicare payment) prior to that case reaching outlier status. Moreover, if LTCHs adjust their procedures so that patients beyond the applicable threshold that are discharged from referring acute care hospitals prior to their LTCH admission have received a full episode of care at the discharging acute (that is, they reach outlier status), Medicare payment for LTCH discharges will be based on the otherwise unadjusted LTCH PPS payment, which has been developed based upon averaging principles.

Comment: Some commenters said that the proposed 25 percent rule would be duplicative of the payment adjustment made under the IPPS post-acute transfer policy. One commenter noted that ''* * * 85 percent of DRGs applicable to short-term acute care hospital discharges to LTCHs are subject to [the post-acute transfer] policy.'' Another commenter asked CMS to comment on why the IPPS post-acute transfer policy does not appropriately adjust for payment when cases transferred from the acute care hospital ultimately become SSO discharges in the LTCH setting.

Another commenter suggested that we provide policies under the acute IPPS to address inappropriate or early discharges and requested that we use post-acute transfer rules, re-admission rules, and DRGs for acute care hospitals to address the issue of inappropriate transfers instead of penalizing LTCHs.

Response: As we have discussed in the previous LTCH final rules, the IPPS post-acute transfer lessens the incentive for an IPPS hospital to transfer a patient to another hospital early in the patient's stay to minimize its costs while still receiving the full DRG payment from Medicare. Although the post-acute care transfer policy only affects DRGs that meet the criteria specified under § 412.4, we continue to monitor trends in post-acute transfers. In addition, we may make additional DRGs subject to the IPPS post-acute transfer policy if the data demonstrate that it is appropriate to do so. Although we expect the post-acute transfer policy to have an impact on the discharge behavior of acute care hospitals because of the reduced payments that they will receive for qualified discharges, the post-acute transfer policy does not necessarily affect the issues being addressed by the SSO policy change. Both, the IPPS post-acute transfer policy and the proposed RY 2008 SSO policy, help to ensure that Medicare payments are appropriate given the types of treatment provided in each setting.

We believe that the revised payment formula for SSO patients that we are finalizing will appropriately pay LTCHs for delivering services to patients who do not otherwise require the lengths of stay that are characteristic of LTCHs. The SSO policy will address payments to LTCHs for patients discharged from the acute care hospital even after the geometric ALOS.

With respect to the comment about the 25 percent policy being duplicative of the IPPS post-acute transfer provision, we would note that the post

acute transfer policy focuses on a truncated length of stay at an acute care hospital that will be paid for under the IPPS, prior to the case reaching the geometric mean LOS for that DRG as specified in § 412.4(c) and (f). The policy that we are finalizing focuses on determining the appropriate payment to the LTCH, where the patient who has already been treated at the acute care hospital (up to the geometric mean LOS) has been ''transferred'' to the LTCH care prior to receiving full treatment at the ''transferring'' hospital. We believe such a stay is a continuation of the patient's original stay at the first hospital, and therefore, that Medicare should pay for such care based on a LTCH PPS payment adjusted to what would otherwise be equivalent to what would have been paid under the IPPS.

Comment: Some commenters wrote in support of extending the comment period from 60 days to 6 months to allow commenters additional time to collaborate for the good of the industry.

Response: We do not believe that a 6-month comment period is warranted or necessary. Consistent with section 1871 of the Act, we provide for a 60-day comment period. This deadline is necessary in order to implement and establish policy changes and payment updates under the LTCH PPS for an effective date of July 1.

We received 270 comments during the comment period and we believe that both the number and the nature of the comments received demonstrate that the comment period was sufficient for commenters to submit relevant and meaningful comments.

Comment: We received many comments that challenged the IPPS-equivalent payment adjustment that we proposed to extend to LTCHs and LTCH satellites for Medicare discharges in excess of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold that had been admitted from referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH.

One commenter maintained that we have determined a payment penalty for freestanding LTCHs for every patient over a 25 percent threshold requiring long term care who is admitted from any single acute care hospital referral source. Another commenter stated that an LTCH could not have more than 25 percent of its patients referred from any one general hospital. Many commenters claimed that our proposal to pay ''under the IPPS'' for LTCH cases ignores data indicating that LTCHs sustain higher costs than IPPS hospitals in treating Medicare inpatients that are grouped to the same DRG. The commenters stated that costs are higher than they are at acute care hospitals because patients are much sicker than at acute care hospitals. Several commenters included data that indicated that they would sustain substantial financial losses under this policy.

Response: We disagree with the commenters who asserted that under § 412.536 and also the revised § 412.534 we have proposed to pay all LTCHs ''under the IPPS'' for discharges in excess of 25 percent or the applicable percentage) from an individual referring hospital. As we have noted elsewhere in these responses, if a Medicare beneficiary is treated at an acute care hospital and continues to need further acute hospital-level care, the patient could remain at the acute care hospital. A discharge from the acute care hospital and admission to a LTCH (which is also certified as an acute care hospital) could be appropriately seen as an extension of the stay at the discharging acute care hospital and as such, should not require Medicare to pay for ''different resource use''. We further disagree with the commenters who call the extension of the 25 percent threshold a ''payment penalty for freestanding LTCHs for every patient over a 25 percent threshold who comes from any single acute care hospital'' and the commenter that stated that ''an LTCH could not have more than 25 percent of its patients referred from any one general hospital.'' As we have noted elsewhere in these responses, the 25 percent threshold is not a patient quota system. By virtue of the fact that more than 25 percent of the LTCH's discharges had been admitted from an individual referring hospital, it is apparent that the LTCH has an ongoing, working relationship with the referring hospital. This policy should lead LTCHs to carefully determine which patients should be admitted from the referring hospital. A patient who is hospitalized in an acute care hospital continues to require acute hospital-level care, generally should not be discharged before the referring hospital has provided the patient with a full episode of care. As discussed elsewhere in these responses, we believe that a patient stay that reaches the HCO threshold at an acute care hospital would be considered to have received a complete episode of care and for such a patient who has received a full episode of care at an acute care hospital, should that patient require further acute level care at a LTCH, Medicare will make an unadjusted additional payment to the LTCH.

Our concern is that many patients that are admitted to LTCHs could have completed this care at the referring hospital to which they were originally admitted. As we have detailed previously in this preamble, in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 48916) we finalized a payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs (that is, HwHs and satellites at § 412.534), which provides that if a LTCH's or satellite's discharges admitted from its host hospital exceed 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) of its discharges for the LTCH HwHs or satellite's cost reporting period, an adjusted payment will be made at the lesser of the otherwise full payment under the LTCH PPS and an adjusted amount under the LTCH PPS that would be equivalent to what Medicare would otherwise pay under the IPPS. In determining whether a hospital meets this percent test, patients transferred from the host hospital that have already qualified for outlier payments at the host would not count as part of the host 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) and the payment for those patients would also not be subject to the adjustment. Those patients would be eligible for an unadjusted payment under the LTCH PPS. (Discharges admitted from the host before the LTCH crosses the 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) threshold would also be paid without the adjustment under the LTCH PPS (69 FR 49213). MedPAC submitted a comment that addressed its concerns with the 25 percent threshold policy for co-located LTCHs in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule.

Specifically, the Commission noted that ''freestanding LTCHs also have strong relationships with acute care hospitals, and that where on average LTCH HwHs receive 61 percent of their patients from their hosts, freestanding LTCHs receive 42 percent from their primary referring hospital * * * [that] there are some risks in our proposed 25 percent policy; (a) the 25 percent rule that only applies to LTCH HwHs and not to freestanding LTCHs and may therefore be inequitable; (b) it does not ensure that patients go to the most appropriate post-acute setting; (c) this approach may be circumvented by an increase in the number of freestanding LTCHs instead of LTCH HwH.'' As we stated in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, ''MedPAC shares our concern that the LTCH payment system creates an incentive for unbundling of the IPPS in addition to overpayment for the care provided by LTCHs and that this concern is great, particularly, in the case of a LTCH HwH * * *'' (69 FR 49211).

In establishing the concept of ''functional separateness,'' in the FY 1995 IPPS final rule, we were identifying a broader phenomenon than just the relationship between a host

acute care hospital and a LTCH HwH or satellite of a LTCH. We also reviewed MedPAC's comment (discussed previously in this section) on non-co-located LTCH referral patterns and noted that despite the fact that we limited the payment adjustment established in FY 2005 to LTCH HwHs and satellites, ''* * * [w]e took considerable note of these comments and the specific information that they included'' (59 FR 45391).

We further stated that ''* * * [s]ince the October 1, 2004 implementation of the payment adjustment for LTCH HwHs and satellites of LTCHs at § 412.534, through our LTCH PPS monitoring initiative (see section X. of this preamble), we have become aware that the growth in the LTCH universe is now occurring through the development of freestanding LTCHs'' and that [r]eviews of public documents posted at the corporate Web site and analysis of the expected consequences of the policy at other investor-oriented sites describe a focus on building freestanding LTCHs, which we believe may imply a response to the payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs established under § 412.534.'' At that time, we noted data analyses from FY 2004 and FY 2005 MedPAR files of sole-source (for example, one hospital referring to one LTCH) relationships between acute care hospitals and non-co-located LTCHs and we stated that we believed that the danger of LTCHs functioning as ''units'' appears to be occurring not only in LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites but also with freestanding LTCHs (71 FR 27877 through 27879).

We stated that, in many cases, these non-co-located LTCHs and their sole referral source may be functioning in ways that appear to have erased the line of ''functional separateness'' between these LTCHs and their referring acute care hospitals ((71 FR 27877 through 27879, 59 FR 45391).

Many commenters noted that they would experience considerable financial losses if we implemented the extension of the 25 percent threshold policy. We believe that our finalized policy will result in a behavioral change for LTCHs, and LTCHs will take steps to assure that no more than 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) of the hospital's discharges are patients that had not already reached outlier status at the referring hospital, to assure that all Medicare payments to LTCHs will be made, without adjustment under this policy.

In response to the commenters that asserted LTCH patients are much sicker than acute care patients, we note that it is our understanding from our own data analyses, as well as work done by RTI that costs at LTCHs on a per diem basis are lower than costs for the same DRG at acute care hospitals. For example, RTI performed an analysis of the 2005 MedPAR files and determined the per diem payment for the 20 most common LTC–DRGs treated in LTCHs as outlined in Table 6.

TABLE 6.—AVERAGE PAYMENT PER DAY FOR THE TOP 20 DRGS ON LTCH ADMISSIONS, LTCH VERSUS ACUTE, 2005 MEDPAR

Top 20 LTCH DRGs	LTCH			Acute		
	Average payment	Average length of stay	Average payment per day	Average payment	Average length of stay	Average payment per day
475: Respiratory System Diagnosis With Ventilator Support	$58,828	37.6	$1,815	$21,696	10.4	$4,187
271: Skin Ulcers	26,652	28.8	1,009	5,525	6.6	1,298
087: Pulmonary Edema & Respiratory Failure	36,552	26.6	1,498	7,211	6.3	1,893
079: Respiratory Infections & Inflammations Age >17 w CC	26,545	23.7	1,235	8,654	8.0	1,690
088: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease	20,822	19.4	1,156	4,441	4.8	1,369
089: Simple Pneumonia & Pleurisy Age >17 w CC	22,356	20.8	1,167	5,189	5.5	1,355
249: Aftercare, Musculoskeletal System & Connective Tissue	21,601	25.2	914	3,816	3.9	1,701
416: Septicemia Age >17	25,962	23.5	1,189	9,309	7.4	2,192
466: Aftercare w/o History of Malignancy as Secondary Diagnosis	20,962	22.3	1,018	4,637	4.7	1,919
012: Degenerative Nervous System Disorders	23,804	27.3	976	4,651	5.3	1,298
462: Rehabilitation	19,149	22.6	903	9,621	9.3	1,125
263: Skin Graft &/or Debrid for Skin Ulcer or Cellulitis w CC	41,006	42.0	1,054	11,929	10.3	1,930
127: Heart Failure & Shock	21,252	20.8	1,088	5,425	5.0	1,641
316: Renal Failure	25,420	23.3	1,190	7,114	6.1	1,936
418: Postoperative & Post-Traumatic Infections	25,766	25.6	1,090	6,348	6.0	1,633
430: Psychoses	15,019	27.0	651	3,955	7.6	869
238: Osteomyelitis	27,639	30.4	973	7,934	7.7	1,584
277: Cellulitis Age >17 w CC	20,005	21.7	980	4,464	5.3	1,182
144: Other Circulatory System Diagnoses w CC	22,990	22.3	1,112	7,282	5.7	2,290
320: Kidney & Urinary Tract Infections Age >17 w CC	21,491	22.5	1,027	4,369	4.9	1,266

Source: \\rtimas04\hser\Project\08686\006 IPPS\001 LTCH\common\jpotelle\programs\gage030.log.

Furthermore, LTCHs utilize such information regarding their lower costs for treating patients in their advertising. We refer commenters to the following question and answer from the Internet site of a large LTCH chain: The question: ''How can a long term acute care hospital be less expensive than a short term acute care hospital?'' The answer: ''Patients transferred to a long term acute care hospital are medically stable and do not require the critical care resources found in short term acute care hospitals, which are typically the most costly to a patient.''

Comment: Many commenters challenged the basis of the proposed payment adjustment that would result if we finalized our proposed expansion of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold to LTCH and LTCH satellite discharges that were admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH. According to these commenters, in section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA, the Congress specified that the payment policies under the LTCH PPS should ''reflect differences in patient resource use and cost.'' These commenters asserted that payment adjustments under the LTCH PPS should not be based upon referral sources but rather on the ''costs of treatment'' and ''costs of care'' at LTCHs.

Response: There is considerable precedent regarding our concerns with the financial implications to the Medicare Trust Fund from patient-shifting between acute and post acute settings that could result in two Medicare payments, one to the acute care hospital and another under the LTCH PPS for one episode of care. As noted elsewhere in these responses, this concern was first addressed by the Congress in establishing the post-acute transfer policy at section 1886(d)(5)(J) of the Act, which we subsequently implemented at § 412.4. Furthermore, in the FY 1995 IPPS final rule, we addressed the financial consequences to the Medicare program of the patient-shifting that was occurring between acute care hospitals and co-located LTCHs. At that time, we noted that the ''effect of this process is to extend the [LTCH] exclusion to what is for all practical purposes a [LTCH] unit'' (59 FR 45389).

We further stated that paying the co-located LTCH as a hospital excluded from the IPPS ''may not be appropriate'' under these circumstances because ''[e]xclusion of long-term care units could inadvertently encourage hospitals to try to abuse the prospective payment systems, by diverting all long-stay cases to the excluded unit, leaving only the shorter, less costly cases to be paid for under the prospective payment systems' (59 FR 45389). Therefore, in accordance with sections 1102 and 1871 of the Act which ''confer authority on the Secretary to establish rules and regulations as may be necessary to administer the Medicare program'' (59 FR 45390), we established separateness and control criteria at *then* § 412.23(e)(3)(i) which a co-located LTCH would have to meet to be paid as a hospital excluded from the IPPS. We believed at that time that ''the extent to which a facility accepts patients from outside sources can be an important indicator of its status as a separate facility'' (59 FR 45392). Therefore, at that time, among other indications of separateness, we adopted a ''75 percent referral standard'' which required that no more than 25 percent of the LTCHs discharges be admitted from its host to be paid as a hospital excluded from the IPPS. Accordingly, the source of an LTCH's patients as one potential variable since FY 2005 as to whether or not a LTCH receives Medicare payment under the payment system for hospitals excluded from the IPPS, has been a basis for determining whether or not a LTCH was an independent hospital or functioning as a unit of an acute care hospital.

In response to the commenters who maintained that the BBRA mandates that payment under the LTCH PPS is to reflect the ''differences in patient resource use and costs'' at LTCHs, we note that in general, with respect to the development of the LTCH PPS, section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA requires, among other things, that the Secretary shall develop a PPS and that this PPS shall include an adequate classification system that reflects the difference in resource use and costs. Section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA provides a modification of requirements with respect to the implementation of the PPS. It provides that the Secretary * * * shall examine the feasibility and the impact of basing payments under such a system on the sue of existing (or refined) hospital diagnosis-related groups (DRGs) that have been modified to account for different resource use of long term care hospital patients. The Secretary shall examine and may provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term care hospital payment system, including adjustments to DRG weights, area wage adjustments, geographic reclassification, outliers, update, and a disproportionate share adjustment * * *. We believe that our payment system fully satisfies these requirements.

If a patient needing additional hospital-level acute care is discharged to another acute care hospital prior to completing a full episode of care at the first hospital, we believe that there is a strong presumption that the second hospital (the LTCH) is behaving like a step-down unit of the first acute care hospital and Medicare will be generating two payments, one under the IPPS and another under the LTCH PPS for one episode of care.

Therefore, we are finalizing our extension of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment (after the 3-year transition period described elsewhere in this section) for discharges admitted from referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH at § 412.536 and grandfathered LTCHs and satellites at § 412.534(h) under the authority of sections 123(a) of the BBRA of 1999 as amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA of 2000 which authorize the Secretary to make adjustments under the LTCH PPS to LTCH hospitals.

In addition, section 123 of the BBRA, as amended by section 307(b)(1) of the BIPA, confers broad discretionary authority on the Secretary to develop and implement a PPS for LTCHs, specifically mandating only ''a per discharge prospective payment system'' that includes an ''adequate payment classification system * * * based on diagnosis-related groups (DRGS) that reflects the differences in patient resource use and costs, and shall maintain budget neutrality.'' Section 307 of the BIPA further provides that the Secretary ''may provide for appropriate adjustments to the long-term hospital payment system* * *''

As discussed previously, we are finalizing the expansion of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment (after the 3-year transition period described elsewhere in this section) originally established for co-located LTCHs and satellites with regards to patients admitted to the LTCH from a co-located hospital at § 412.534 to govern the relationship between any referring hospital and an LTCH or LTCH satellite not co-located with that referring hospital. We believe that even in the absence of co-location, the same level of scrutiny must be applied to patient-shifting between acute care hospitals paid for under the IPPS and LTCHs to assure that Medicare is not paying under the IPPS and then generating another unadjusted payment under the LTCH PPS for one episode of care. As discussed elsewhere in these responses, an LTCH is certified as an acute care hospital and we believe that appropriate and responsible payment policy under the Medicare program dictates that if a patient at an acute care hospital paid under the IPPS continues to need treatment at an acute care hospital-level, that patient should remain where he or she is presently being treated until a full episode of care has been delivered prior to being discharged to a LTCH for a different episode of care. We continue to believe that our formulating a payment adjustment for treatment at a second acute care hospital (which is in fact just paid as a LTCH) is both appropriate and necessary for Medicare to be a prudent purchaser of medical care for its beneficiaries. As described above, under this payment adjustment, which we are finalizing at § 412.536 and at revised § 412.534, during a cost reporting period, if an LTCH exceeds the 25 percent threshold of Medicare discharges from *any* referring hospital (or the applicable adjustment if the referral source is rural, MSA-dominant, or single urban) and the patient did not achieve outlier status at the referring hospital prior to being discharged to the LTCH, Medicare will make a payment adjustment for those discharges under Subpart O for cases beyond the threshold, based upon the lesser of the otherwise unadjusted payment or an adjusted LTCH PPS payment that is

equivalent to the amount that would otherwise be paid under the IPPS.

Comment: Many commenters claimed that the proposed extension of the 25 percent payment threshold is a consequence of our ''incorrect assertion'' that admission to an LTCH is only legitimate if the patient reaches HCO status at an acute care hospital prior to being discharged for admittance to a LTCH for additional treatment. The commenters believe that under this policy the only way that a patient can receive a full episode of care at an acute is by reaching HCO status. Several commenters quoted data which stated that the percentage of discharges from acute care hospitals which received full Medicare payment is generally close to the percentage of discharges that were admitted to LTCHs that also received a full payment at the acute. The commenters believe that this suggests that a full episode of care is being provided to all of these patients.

Another commenter stated that it is ''grossly inappropriate'' for CMS to use outlier status as a statistical standard for whether a hospital has furnished a ''full ''episode of care in a case. Several commenters requested that if we object to two payments for a LTCH patient (that is, one to the referring IPPS hospital and another for payment under the LTCH PPS) we should address the fact that two payments would be generated if the patient was admitted to any post-acute provider such as an IRF or a SNF.

Response: The ultimate goal of our development of payment policy under the LTCH PPS is to assure appropriate and cost-effective payments under the Medicare program for services provided by LTCHs. We have informed the LTCH community in several forums, including notices, that although we were not challenging the high level of care delivered at many LTCHs, it was manifestly unclear how we could identify the point during an acute care hospitalization when a patient would cease to be appropriately placed in that setting such that admission to and further treatment in a LTCH would constitute a reasonable and fiscally responsible standard of care. Our data reveals that approximately 80 percent of LTCH patients are admitted following care at an acute care hospital, where Medicare would have would have paid for their care under the IPPS. We maintain that if a hospitalized patient continues to need acute-level care that such a patient could remain in the acute care hospital for the purpose of receiving this care and not be discharged to another acute care level hospital, like a LTCH until the full episode of treatment has been delivered.

Accordingly, where an LTCH has exceeded the applicable threshold and has thus demonstrated that it is in essence serving as a unit of the referring hospital, it is appropriate to adjust the otherwise payable LTCH PPS payment. We understand that some LTCHs specialize in areas such as ventilator care and weaning or wound care and that some of these facilities are highly respected across all provider settings. However, these same types of patients are being treated by acute care hospitals nationally with similar results. Furthermore, the largest percentage of LTCH patients nationwide would typically fall into the general category of ''medically complex.'' Nationwide, ''medically complex'' patients are certainly being successfully treated by acute care hospitals. We have thus far been unable to discover or establish a ''bright line'' for purposes of demarcating an appropriate discharge from the referring hospital and then admission for appropriate and necessary treatment at an LTCH, paid for under the LTCH PPS. However, since patients who fit the ''LTCH profile'' are often HCO patients at acute care hospitals (particularly in areas where there is not high LTCH penetration), to determine if a hospital has exceeded its threshold we believe that it is both functional and reasonable to use reaching outlier status at an acute care hospital to determine the delivery of a full episode of care. (RTI report, p. 32–48)

In response to the commenters who noted the comparability of the percentage of all discharges from an acute care hospital that had either reached or not reached outlier status (78 percent) with the percentage of acute care hospital patients who were subsequently admitted to LTCHs following their discharge from the acute care hospital who had either reached or not reached outlier status (also 78 percent), stating that this proved that both had received a ''full episode of care,'' we do not agree with this conclusion. Furthermore, the commenters data is based on a universe of total discharges from acute care hospitals which is approximately 13 million discharges. The universe of discharges from acute care hospitals to LTCHs is less than 1 percent of those discharges (approximately 112,000). Since the LTCHs are admitting such a small percentage of acute care hospitals' total cases, it is likely that LTCHs are targeting a specific subset of these patients that would have reached outlier status, if not for the presence of the LTCH.

With regard to the comments on patients discharged from acute care hospitals that are admitted to other post-acute providers such as an IRF or a SNF, we would note that there is a distinction in the type of care provided at these settings and at an LTCH. An IRF provides a specialized post-acute service, that is, rehabilitation, for specific medical conditions. A SNF does not even provide hospital-level care. Since an LTCH is certified as an acute care hospital and in fact can provide the same type of care as an acute care hospital that is paid under the IPPS, it is necessary to address the possibility of an LTCH acting as an a unit of an acute care hospital and to differentiate between acute care patients being treated at an (short-term) acute care hospital and those being treated at a LTCH.

We see no correlation between the fact that the commenter has identified a common percentage number and their conclusion that this proves that LTCH patients had received a full episode of care. The fact that nearly 90 percent of LTCH patients had come to the LTCH without achieving outlier status at the acute hospital, which had certainly been providing acute level care to the patient prior to their admission to the LTCH, indicates that for these ''medically complex'' cases, the acute care hospital may be routinely looking to discharge those patients to the LTCH, prior to their reaching outlier status and thus not receiving a full episode of care at the acute care hospital.

Comment: Several commenters questioned whether the extension of the 25 percent payment threshold would apply to those patients who had been admitted to an LTCH from some other provider setting than an acute care hospital, such as a IRF or a SNF?

Response: The extension of the 25 percent threshold policy to discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH at § 412.536 is based on the policy that we finalized for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534 for FY 2005 in the IPPS final rule (69 FR 48916). As we have stated above, we believe that many of the concerns that we expressed in our analysis of co-located LTCHs, regarding the financially-advantageous but clinically unnecessary shifting of patients from acute care hospitals to LTCHs, is also an issue when the LTCH is not co-located with the referring hospital. Therefore, although the vast majority of host/LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite arrangements are between acute care hospitals and LTCHs, we specified in the FY 2005 final IPPS rule that under § 412.22(e), any inpatient

hospital-level provider could serve as a host to an excluded hospital. Therefore, the policy adjustment that we were finalizing based upon the percentage of patients from one hospital that upon discharge became inpatients at a co-located LTCH, at § 412.534, was also applicable when the host hospital was not an acute care hospital (69 FR 49198).

Furthermore, we stated that applying the option of a discharge payment based upon the lesser of the otherwise unadjusted payment amount under Subpart O or payment under the LTCH PPS based upon an IPPS-equivalent amount was appropriate when the host hospital was an IRF, because ''[w]e believe that it is appropriate to pay the LTCH HwH or LTCH satellite that is co-located with an IRF or IPF and exceeds the applicable threshold at the IPPS equivalent rate and not a LTCH PPS rate that would be equivalent to the amount otherwise paid under the IRF or IPF PPS rate, since the HwH and the satellite LTCH are, as we explained earlier in this section, facilities that in many ways are comparable to an acute care hospital'' (72 FR 4811; 71 FR 4704 through 4719).

We are finalizing the extension of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment to discharges from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH because we believe that our concerns that patient stays are being inappropriately truncated at host hospitals resulting in admissions to LTCH HwHs or satellites also occur between LTCHs and LTCH satellites receiving patients from referring hospitals not on the same campus. As noted elsewhere in this section, we have concentrated on the relationships between referring acute care hospitals and non-co-located LTCHs in this discussion, because approximately 80 percent of Medicare patients in LTCHs are admitted from acute care hospitals. However, we believe that the same concerns, articulated above, would also exist when the patient source is not an acute care hospital. As we noted in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, ''[t]here could still be a financial incentive on the part of the referring hospital (for example, an IRF, to prematurely discharge a beneficiary to a LTCH for additional post-acute treatment in order to avoid absorbing high treatment costs under the IRF outlier policy at § 412.624(e)(5)) that would result in two Medicare payments, one to the initial provider and the other for payment under the LTCH PPS for a single episode of beneficiary care'' (72 FR 4812). Although we recognize that a patient could experience a medical crisis while an inpatient at an IRF, we would reiterate that typically, the most appropriate setting for such urgent care would be a general acute care hospital, rather than a LTCH. The policy that we are finalizing would not be applicable to a patient admitted to a LTCH from a SNF since a SNF does not deliver hospital-level care and therefore duplication or substitution of services by a LTCH is not a relevant issue.

Comment: One commenter believes that the extension of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment deprives Medicare beneficiaries of their right to receive medically-necessary services in a LTCH. Therefore, if we finalize the extension of the 25 percent threshold policy, we are violating beneficiary rights and we should provide a notice of non-coverage to beneficiaries regarding this issue. Furthermore, the commenter reminded us that beneficiaries would also be entitled to appeal such a notification to the QIO operating in their State. The commenter stated that the patient whose case would cause the LTCH to exceed the 25 percent threshold referred from a particular referring hospital (that is, the patient who would represent 26 percent) and all those that follow, are entitled to such a notice. The commenter also provides a lengthy discussion of the statutes, regulations, and case law that underlay beneficiary appeal rights.

Response: We would emphasize that we are finalizing a policy in this regulation regarding the payment threshold that Medicare is establishing to avoid generating two payments, one to the initial referring hospital and another under the LTCH PPS, for a single episode of care delivered to a beneficiary. We are not depriving Medicare beneficiaries of their rights to receive treatment at a LTCH, but rather, we have established a payment adjustment for such treatment under particular conditions.

Since the inception of the Medicare program in 1966, policies have been established to determine what the Federal government believes is appropriate payment to hospitals for the delivery of medical services to beneficiaries. Hospitals that elect to participate in the Medicare program are required to comply with the policies established by the program, including the establishment of payment rates and payment adjustments. Therefore, we do not believe that issuing an adjustment that could impact on a hospital's Medicare payments is a radical or unique act. The establishment of a payment policy that may result in payment adjustments for certain admissions is well within the existing regulatory framework. Furthermore, the basis for the policy that we are finalizing at this time, is an extension of a policy that has been in effect since FY 2005, when we established the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold policy for co-located LTCHs at § 412.534. At that time, we stated that we were ''* * * providing an adjustment to the payment under the LTCH PPS in accordance with the broad authority conferred on the Secretary by the Congress in section 123(a) of the BBRA of 2000 amended by section 307(b) of the BIPA of 2001 to include ''appropriate adjustments'' in the establishment of a PPS for LTCHs' (69 FR 49204). We continue to believe that there is a clear distinction between medical decision-making and payment policy, particularly * * * when the patient is a Medicare beneficiary and the medically necessary services are covered by Medicare'' (69 FR 49204).

LTCHs, for example, are required to meet the greater than 25-day ALOS requirement to retain designation as a LTCH; therefore, LTCHs will factor in that on-going requirement when making specific patient admission decisions during a cost reporting period. The need to comply with various compliance percentage requirements for treating certain conditions in order to qualify for IRF designation, under § 412.23(b), also impacts which patients are admitted to IRFs during a cost reporting period. In these two examples, hospitals currently evaluate admissions during a cost reporting period because a hospital's noncompliance with Medicare requirements regarding LOS and percentage of patients meeting the requirements at § 412.23(b)(2), respectively, could risk its designation as a hospital that is excluded from the IPPS. Therefore, we believe that the circumstance of a LTCH determining which, and under what circumstances, patients should be admitted is an already established feature in the LTCH admission process and should be based on medical criteria and not based on the profitability of treating a specific patient.

Furthermore, the issuance of a Hospital-Issued Notices of Noncoverage (HINNs) by the Medicare program is not applicable to the above described circumstance. Specifically, a LTCH's decision not to admit a specific patient is not a decision by the Medicare program to not cover the service. Rather, it is a determination by the LTCH of the type of service or patient that the facility has a level of expertise in treating. (We specify the conditions under which the

Medicare program is required to issue a HINN on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/BNI/05_HINNs.asp#TopOfPage*.)

In response to the commenter's belief that a beneficiary who is not admitted to a LTCH because of the payment policy that we are finalizing should appeal the determination to the QIO operating in his or her State, we would state that the decision to admit a patient is made by the hospital. Specifically, section 1802(a) of the Act stipulates that ''Any individual entitled to insurance benefits under this title may obtain health services from any institution, agency, or person qualified to participate under this title, *if such institution, agency or person undertakes to provide him such services* (emphasis added). We emphatically reiterate that we are not preventing the admission of patients to a LTCH; rather, we are establishing a methodology for determining what are fair and reasonable payments based on the type of patient treated by the LTCH. Moreover, it is our expectation that extending the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment threshold policy to discharges from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH will result in LTCHs focusing their mission with respect to referrals from acute care hospitals, and on treating patients that had a complete episode of care at the referring hospital, before being admitted to the LTCH.

Comment: Many commenters stated that there were major differences between the patients treated at LTCHs and at those referred to as ''short-term'' acute care hospitals. They also listed the significant distinctions between the levels of care delivered by these two types of hospitals. These commenters asserted that acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS are ''just not capable'' of delivering the level of care required by typical LTCH patients. The commenters noted that MedPAC, RTI, and even CMS have stated that LTCHs effectively treat very sick patients. One commenter stated that there was ''evidence that patients who would become subject to the 25 percent rule are different from patients in short term acute care hospitals, and therefore, there is no empirical basis whatsoever for CMS' assumption that LTCHs systematically engage in substitution of service.'' According to commenters, LTCHs have specialized care that is not available in acute care hospitals since the treatment model is entirely different. The commenters maintained that acute care hospitals ''* * * are diagnosis based where LTCHs provide specialized programs of whole-patients recovery'' for patients who require an entire multidisciplinary team. The commenters emphasized that LTCHs use a ''* * * team approach towards healing the patient versus stabilizing an acute episode.'' They also asserted that LTCHs and acute care hospitals do not treat identical conditions and patients who are forced to remain in an acute care setting could receive ''sub-standard care'' with the result being poorer health outcomes, longer stays, and even higher costs. The commenter believes that patients who are medically unstable, not progressing, or have failed ventilator-weaning can often benefit from a multidisciplinary program that LTCHs specialize in. In fact, some commenters point to a level of care that is found nowhere else in the medical care continuum but by staff with expertise and experience unique to LTCHs.

Response: In response to the commenters, we would first state the following axiom of hospital policy in the Medicare program: LTCHs, while being unique based on maintaining an average LOS in excess of 25 days, are certified as acute care hospitals and provide hospital-level services to patients. Acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS are throughout the country treating patients requiring hospital-level care often with lengths of stay comparable to those that are typical of LTCHs. We believe the commenters are attempting to establish a clear distinction between the patients that are appropriate for treatment at LTCHs and patients that are appropriately treated at acute care hospitals. Across the United States, the over 3,700 acute care hospitals that discharge approximately 13 million Medicare beneficiaries treat the full range of medical issues including those that the commenters identify as LTCH cases. We do not question that many LTCHs have highly regarded reputations for their success in treating respiratory and ventilator cases (DRG 475), but, as detailed in the RTI report, the 2004 MedPAR files indicate that where LTCHs treated 13,394 cases assigned to DRG 475, acute care hospitals treated 18,727 Medicare patients with an additional 7,072 HCOs, in DRG 475. For DRG 88, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), LTCHs treated 4,894 cases where acute care hospitals treated 37,523 cases. Data on other common DRGs treated in LTCHs as compared to the same DRG treated in acute care hospitals reflect a similar pattern, particularly among the DRGs that could fall into the broad category of ''medically complex'' patients. (Table 3–2, RTI report, p. 35) We understand that MedPAC and RTI noted that many LTCHs deliver a high level of care to very sick Medicare beneficiaries, with fine doctors, exemplary nursing care, and top-notch rehabilitation therapists, but we also know that many acute care hospitals throughout the nation are treating the same types of patients and similarly delivering excellent care. In addition, we are aware that some LTCHs specialize in a particular subset of patients and achieve noteworthy success in their treatment of, for example, ventilator-weaning or wound care; however, similar patients are also receiving care in acute care hospitals with similar results. Therefore, we disagree that acute care hospitals are incapable of competently treating Medicare beneficiaries that happen to fall within the DRGs that LTCHs identify as their specialties and that any patients falling into such categories would receive ''substandard'' care at an acute care hospital.

Commenters also stated that the Congress established the distinction between acute care hospitals and LTCHs by excluding LTCHs from the IPPS in 1983. In the FY 2003 LTCH PPS final rule (67 FR 55954), which presented the initial payment policies that we established for the LTCH PPS, we briefly reviewed the history of the development of the distinction between hospitals that were to be paid under the IPPS and those that would be excluded, among which were a small group of hospitals that were called LTCHs. In that rule, we stated that ''[t]he Congress excluded these hospitals from the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system because they typically treated cases that involved stays that were, on average, longer or more costly than would be predicted by the DRG system.'' The legislative history of the 1983 Social Security Amendments stated that, ''the DRG system was developed for short-term acute care general hospitals and as currently constructed does not adequately take into account special circumstances of diagnoses requiring long stays. (Report of the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, to Accompany HR 1900, H.R. Rept. No. 98–25, at 141 (1983)) Therefore, these hospitals could be systemically underpaid if the same DRG system were applied to them (67 FR 55957). Following enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1983, we implemented the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system on October 1, 1983, including the initial publication in the **Federal Register** of the rules and regulations for the hospital

inpatient prospective payment system—the September 1, 1983 interim final rule'' (48 FR 39752, 67 FR 55957).

The 33 LTCHs in existence at the start of the IPPS in 1983 (that were included on the HCFA exclusion list) were described in 1987, in a presentation letter to President George H.W. Bush from then-Secretary Otis R. Bowen, M.D., that preceded a Report to Congress produced by Health Economics Research, Inc. on the ''Developing a Prospective Payment System for Excluded Hospitals,'' (Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration, Office of Research and Demonstration, HCFA Pub. No. 03262), the Secretary notes that ''Long-term Hospitals are a heterogeneous set of institutions located on the Eastern Seaboard, whose mission is the treatment of patients who are seriously or terminally ill with multiple diseases. In other regions of the country, these same patients would be treated in hospitals or skilled nursing facilities * * *''

As discussed in the 1984 Report to Congress, CMS (formerly HCFA) listed 61 hospitals on the ''HCFA exclusion list'' throughout the United States. (Medicare OSCAR files reveal that 31 of these original facilities are still in existence in 2007.) The Report states that ''[t]here were 33 hospitals that both identified themselves as chronic care hospitals * * * [that] are most representative of those primarily providing chronic-disease hospital services. Perhaps of most interest is the very long average LOS of patients in these institutions. With one exception, all average length of stays are over 60 days and, with three exceptions, all are over 100 days. There is probably no clear differentiation between certain types of rehabilitative facilities and LTCHs. The differentiation does seem clearer in the case of psychiatric and children's hospitals, though because these eight psychiatric and three children's hospitals had average lengths of stay greater than 25 days, they were placed under the long-term category of exclusions. The 28 remaining hospitals on the HCFA exclusion list are characterized by a mixture of bed types. Many have a large percentage of psychiatric beds and some a large percentage of rehabilitation beds. Some of those hospitals are institutions with a large number of nursing home beds. For example, one hospital examined houses a small number of acute care beds available for patients routinely cared for in SNF and intermediate care facility (ICF)-level beds. The acute care beds are exempted under PPS. The State licenses beds in this facility as chronic disease hospital beds, though the administrator conceded that these beds are virtually indistinguishable from the SNF and ICF level Medicaid beds * * *'' (p. 3–56). The Report identified an additional 25 hospitals that fit the profile of LTCHs, most of which were included in a 1983 AHA Annual Survey. ''Lastly, there were 25 hospitals that were not on the exclusion list, but have either self-identified to the HA as chronic care hospitals or have chronic care beds. Seven of these had mostly acute care beds and a short average LOS, such that they would not qualify for the HCFA exclusion. The remaining 18 all had average length of stays greater than 60 days and 11 had average length of stays greater than 100 days. Though several of these were institutions with just chronic care beds, most also had a disproportionate number of nursing home beds. Possibly, those 18 hospitals could qualify for an exclusion at some future point'' (p. 3–57). ''These hospitals are themselves a diverse, rather anomalous class. As suspected, they have grown up in the interstices of acute, rehabilitation, and nursing home care. Their diversity results from the fact that the role they fill varies with individual State regulatory and financing policies, as well as the surrounding configuration of acute, rehabilitation, and nursing home beds'' (p. 3–59).

We quote this report because we believe that it is vital to understand what the Congress was describing when it excluded 33 LTCHs (in the HCFA list) from the IPPS, ''* * * because the DRG system was developed for short-term acute care general hospitals and as currently constructed does not adequately take into account special circumstances of diagnoses requiring long stays'' and therefore, these hospitals could be systemically underpaid if the same DRG system were applied to them (67 FR 55957). We do not believe that the Congress was identifying the LTCHs in existence in 1983, described above, as facilities expected to deliver care at a level of medical sophistication equivalent to or even surpassing that of a typical acute care hospital.

In 1983, there were 33 LTCHs (plus another 25 from the AHA list); in 1993, there were 105; in 2003, there were 318; and in 2007, there are nearly 400 LTCHs. We do not doubt that the nature and level of the care delivered by most LTCHs has changed markedly since 1983 but we believe that it is both highly inaccurate and misleading to state, as some of our commenters have, that '' 'short term' acute care hospitals are ''just not capable'' of delivering the level of care required by typical LTCH patients; that acute care hospitals ''are diagnosis based where LTCHs provide specialized programs of whole-patients recovery;'' that acute care hospitals do not treat identical conditions and that patients who are forced to remain in an acute care setting could receive ''sub-standard care with the result being poorer health outcomes, longer stays, and even higher costs.'' We do not believe that the evidence detailed above indicates that in excluding LTCHs from the IPPS and explaining this act by the above-quoted rationale in 1983, that it was the Congress' intention to declare that henceforth, certain patients could only reasonably be treated in LTCHs and that treatment at an acute care hospitals for such patients would be ''sub-standard.'' Rather, we believe that the Congress was attempting to describe the provider landscape as it existed at that time and that in so doing, there was a small group of facilities that did not ''cleanly'' fit into any other category, having ''grown up in the interstices of acute, rehabilitation, and nursing home care.'' Report to Congress on the ''Developing a Prospective Payment System for Excluded Hospitals,'' HCFA Pub. No. 03262) (p. 3–59).

Since that time, there have been changes in the LTCH universe, with over 58 percent of the nearly 400 LTCHs being run for-profit (the majority by several large chains); approximately 33 percent run not for profit, and only 8.3 percent now run by a government instrumentality. Accordingly, we believe that the policy we proposed is appropriate to deal with present payment issues that the Medicare program is facing under the LTCH PPS.

Commenters further asserted that acute care hospitals do not and even can not deal with the medical conditions in which LTCH specialize. Even though the LTCH universe has grown to nearly 400, they continue to not be evenly geographically dispersed and therefore, by far, most very sick Medicare inpatients nationwide are treated in acute care hospitals. In FY 2005, there were 130,000 LTCH discharges and 12.7 million discharges from acute care hospitals. A brief review of several major LTCH Web sites contained the following list of conditions in which they specialize:

- Chronic cardiac disorders;
- Neuuromuscular/neurovascular diseases
- Methicillin-resistant staph aureus (MRSA)
- Complex orthopedic conditions
- Wound care complications
- Multi-system organ failure

- Immuno-suppressed conditions
- Respiratory failure
- Dysphagia management
- Post-operative complications
- Multiple intravenous therapies
- Chemotherapy
- Pre- and post-operative organ transplant care
- Chronic nutritional problems
- Total parenteral nutrition (TPN) issues'
- Intensive hemodynamic monitoring
- Renal dialysis
- Telemetry
- EKG testing
- Diagnostic bronchoscopy and endoscopy
- Speech-language pathology
- Surgery support
- Nutritional therapy
- Radiology services
- Laboratory services
- Respiratory therapy
- Physical therapy
- Occupational therapy
- Pharmacy
- Social services

Furthermore, the list of services noted above, are also hardly unique to the LTCH setting.

Comment: One commenter cited several provisions of Federal and State statutes that generally refer to patient transfers, services furnished to a hospital's patients by others under arrangements made by the hospital with them, or a hospital's responsibility to have services available to meet the needs of patients it accepts for treatment. For example, the commenter cites the provision of the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) (specifically, section 1867(g) of the Act) that requires hospitals with specialized capabilities to accept appropriate transfers of unstabilized individuals protected by EMTALA. The commenter also referred to Florida, Texas, and Illinois legislation authorizing arranged-for services and referral and transfer agreements, and The Joint Commission (formerly JCAHO) guidance directing their surveyors to look closely at transfers. However, no specific comment was made.

Response: We do not believe this discussion in any way calls into question the need for the provisions relating to the policies we have proposed. Though the provisions cited do include references to transfers, they do not spell out conditions under which they are acceptable or otherwise establish specific standards to ensure that transfers and services under arrangements do not jeopardize patient health and safety. More importantly, they do not address the key issue of transfers that may not create clear risks for patients, but nevertheless, increase costs in the health care system because they are undertaken for financial rather than medical reasons. Therefore, even though we reviewed this discussion carefully, we made no changes to our proposals based on it.

Comment: Some commenters highlighted the current medical care situation in New Orleans noting that the city is still trying to recover from Hurricane Katrina. The commenters believed that the proposed changes would result in the closure of LTCHs and this would cause hardships on the limited number of physicians practicing in the area. The commenters requested that affected hospitals should be granted a time limited exemption from these rules for up to 5 years.

Response: We are certainly aware of the current state of medical care in Louisiana in general, and specifically in the New Orleans area. We have worked and continue to work closely with State officials and the hospitals in Louisiana to address issues that are important to helping the State rebuild its medical care infrastructure. As stated previously in response to commenters who claimed that these revisions would cause LTCHs to close, we believe that these changes are necessary to assure that the Medicare program is making appropriate payments to these hospitals in the specific situations addressed by these policies. In the case of the expansion of the 25 percent policy to apply to LTCHs and satellites that exceed the threshold on discharges that were admitted from a referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or LTCH satellite, since a LTCH is certified as an acute care hospital, we believe it is appropriate to pay the LTCH under the LTCH PPS a rate that is comparable to the rate paid under the IPPS, where it is demonstrating behavior that indicates that it is serving as a ''unit'' of the referring hospital. Similarly, the revised SSO policy also provides for payments to the LTCH for those SSO cases that have a LOS that is comparable to the LOS of a typical IPPS patient in the same DRG, under the LTCH PPS at an adjusted rate that is comparable to the IPPS rate. We do not believe these policies will cause widespread closure of LTCHs nationally or in Louisiana.

We also note that while in general the threshold under the expansion of the 25 percent policy as finalized in this rule will ultimately be 25 percent, in response to comments requesting that we transition the implementation of this policy, as discussed earlier we are providing for a 3-year transition to allow hospitals additional time to comply with the 25 percent threshold. Therefore, we are establishing a 75 percent threshold for RY 2008 and a 50 percent threshold for RY 2009. The threshold will be reduced to 25 percent beginning with RY 2010. Furthermore, for hospitals in rural areas or those admitting patients from a single hospital MSA effective with RY 2008, the threshold will be 75 percent for RY 2008 and will remain at 50 percent for subsequent rate years. In addition, for LTCHs admitting patients from MSA-dominant hospitals, effective with RY 2009 the threshold will be adjusted based on the referring hospital's percentage of Medicare patients discharged in the MSA, and will be not less than 25 percent and not more than 50 percent.

Comment: Many commenters requested that we clarify how they would be able to comply with the requirements of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment policy if it was finalized. In the particular situation of a MSA-dominant or urban single hospital, where the threshold depends upon the percentage of referring hospital discharges in that MSA, it was requested that we clarify which year of data would applicable.

Response: In establishing this payment provision, originally for co-located LTCHs for FY 2005, we consulted with Medicare's FIs and we were assured that LTCHs will be able to obtain the information that they need in order to comply with this policy from the referring hospital from which they would be admitting patients.

Further, we understand that typically, acute care hospitals have the GROUPER software which enables them to determine the most likely DRG assignment for their patients and additionally, programs that track the costs being incurred by their patients on a daily basis. Therefore, they are with a high degree of accuracy, able to predict when a particular case crosses the outlier threshold. To facilitate such practices by hospitals, we have provided PRICER software for Medicare PPSs available for download on the CMS Web site. We understand that hospitals, including LTCHs, generally also purchase GROUPER software to track DRG assignments.

Therefore, it is our expectation that LTCHs and their referring hospitals will build on their existing working relationship (since this policy applies to situations where over 25 percent of a LTCH's patients were admitted from an individual hospital) and will find it in their mutual interests to share necessary information. We would also expect LTCHs to monitor their admissions and

discharges from their referring hospitals, a process in which they would typically engage as a component of sound business practice.

In response to the comment questioning the determination of the applicable MSA-dominant or urban-single percentage for purposes of LTCH calculations, we agree that it would be inappropriate for this percentage to be based on data occurring *during* a cost reporting period. Therefore, we would note that our policy is to base the percentage on the latest available discharge data that is available prior to the beginning of the LTCH's current fiscal year. We are revising proposed § 412.536(d)(2) to reflect this policy. Furthermore, in response to this comment, at this time, we are also revising the regulation text as it applies to co-located LTCHs. Specifically, at § 412.534(e)(2) where we describe the determination of the percentage threshold for MSA-dominant hosts for LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites, we deleting the phrase, ''for the cost reporting period for which the adjustment was made''.

Comment: One commenter stated that implementing the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment policy, under which Medicare payments would be reconciled, would ''violate a fundamental rule of PPSs that payments will be prospectively set and known in advance by the providers.'' This commenter also stated that the finalizing this regulation would ''in a very real sense, would convert the LTCH PPS into a retroactive system of recovery and settlement with related disputes where CMS would be called upon to produce patient records from hospitals that refer cases to LTCHs as well as individual patient coding and referral hospital financial information to support recovery claims.''

Response: In response to these concerns, we would note that the cost report settlement process (governed by Subpart B of Part 413) is a standard feature of all Medicare PPSs. For example, under the IPPS, a hospital DRG payment may be subject to the DSH or IME adjustments. The DSH adjustment is based on the percentage of Medicaid patients discharged by the hospital during the fiscal year, while the IME adjustment is based on the number of residents trained by the hospital during the fiscal year. Both factors are subject to change based on final settlement of the hospital's cost report. The procedures that we have established for this process envision a reconciliation between hospitals and the Medicare program based on claims submission, special interim payments or periodic interim payments and the final amounts due, as determined by the FI. Such reconciliations are both necessary and expected. There are numerous provisions affecting LTCHs that could result in subsequent redetermination of the payment amounts. For example, involvement of a QIO review of a DRG assignment which may result in a change in DRGs as specified in § 412.513(c), as well as any of the reconsiderations and appeals provided for under subparts G, I, J, or R of Part 405. Moreover, since the start of the LTCH PPS, our regulations on special payment provisions for patients who are transferred to onsite providers and readmitted to a LTCH at § 412.532, specified a 5 percent threshold for LTCH readmittances of patients that had been discharged to an onsite acute care hospital. Payments under this policy would be reconciled following cost report settlement. Finally, the 25 percent threshold for co-located LTCHs, which could result in a redetermination of the payment amount if the threshold is exceeded, has been in effect since FY 2005.

Therefore, we do not believe that the principle of PPS issued by the Medicare program is inconsistent with the extension of the 25 percent payment adjustment threshold under the LTCH PPS.

Comment: Several commenters stated that both of our policy proposals, the extension of the 25 percent threshold policy adjustment and the revision of the SSO policy, are effectively establishing ''admission criteria'' which usurp the exclusive role of QIOs in the Medicare program.

Response: We reiterate that with the finalization of the extension of the 25 percent threshold policy adjustment and the SSO policy, we have not established ''admissions criteria'' for LTCHs. Rather, in keeping with our fiduciary responsibility to oversee Medicare expenditures, we have established payment policies that provide for appropriate Medicare payments for beneficiary care. We describe each of the policies in detail in this preamble. They are distinct policies but they both focus on our goal of determining payment for Medicare services delivered in LTCHs, under particular circumstances that we believe should not significantly exceed payment for similar services otherwise delivered in acute care hospitals.

Because the comments that we received regarding the QIO's role and the implementation of the expansion of the 25 percent threshold policy were fundamentally the same comments submitted regarding the QIOs role and the SSO policy revision, we responded to comments in the SSOs section of this final rule.

In summary, we are finalizing a new provision at § 412.534(h) that effective with discharges occurring during cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, would apply the policies established under existing § 412.534 to grandfathered subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites for Medicare discharges that were admitted from their co-located host hospitals. We are also applying those policies for Medicare discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH to all subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites at § 412.536, generally tracking § 412.534, where applicable. For example, in determining whether a hospital meets the 25 percent criterion, Medicare discharges that have already qualified for outlier payments at the referring hospital would not be included in the count of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital. (We are entitling § 412.536, Special Payment Provisions for LTCHs and Satellites of LTCHs that Discharged Medicare Patients Admitted From a Hospital Not Located in the Same Building or on the Same Campus as the LTCH or Satellite of the LTCH.)

We are also finalizing adjustments to the 25 percent policy at § 412.536 for specific circumstances consistent with the policy for co-located hospitals under § 412.534. At § 412.536(c) for Medicare discharges from subclause (I) LTCHs or LTCH satellites located in rural areas, Medicare discharges in excess of 50 percent, rather that 25 percent of the LTCH's total Medicare discharges for a cost reporting period from an individual referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of the LTCH would be subject to the payment adjustment specified at § 412.536(c). In addition, in the case of a rural subclause (I) LTCH or LTCH satellite facility, in determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital, any patients that had been Medicare outliers at the referring hospital and then discharged to the LTCH or LTCH satellite are not counted towards the threshold percentage (as described above).

In § 412.536, we are also providing that if the referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or satellite of the LTCH is the only other hospital in the MSA or is an MSA-dominant hospital as defined at § 412.536(e)(4), we are allowing the subclause (I) LTCH or LTCH satellite facility a threshold percentage equal to the non-co-located referring hospital's percentage of total

Medicare discharges for hospitals in the MSA. Consistent with our policy at existing § 412.534(e), we are applying a floor of 25 percent and a ceiling of 50 percent to this threshold for these hospitals. As with the existing policy for co-located LTCHs, we believe that this adjusted payment threshold responds to ''the unique needs of these communities'' (69 FR 49207). Similar to the existing provisions at § 412.534, in determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted to the LTCH or LTCH satellite facility from the urban single or MSA dominant hospital, any patients that had been Medicare outliers at the referring hospital before being admitted to the LTCH or LTCH satellite would not count towards the applicable threshold, as discussed above.

The payment adjustment at § 412.536 will be phased-in over 3 years for all LTCH discharges affected by the policies that we are finalizing beginning for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. Under the phase in, the percentage threshold will be the greater of the applicable threshold as specified at 412.536(b),(c), and (d) or the following percentages: For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007 and before July 1, 2008, under the policy that we are finalizing at § 412.536, the percentage of Medicare discharges that may be admitted from a referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH with no payment adjustment is the lesser of the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital during its RY 2005 cost reporting period or 75 percent. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2008 and before July 1, 2009, under the policy that we are finalizing at § 412.536, the percentage of Medicare discharges that may be admitted from the referring hospital not co-located with the LTCH or the satellite of a LTCH, with no payment adjustment, is the lesser of the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital during its RY 2005 cost reporting period or 50 percent. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009 (RY 2010), all subclause (I) LTCHs and LTCH satellites will be subject to the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment for discharges during a cost reporting period that were admitted from any referring hospital. In determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital, patients who reached HCO status at the referring hospital before being admitted to the LTCH or LTCH satellite will not count towards the applicable threshold, as discussed above. A similar phase is provided for the expansion at § 412.534 to grandfathered subclause (I) LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites.

Finally, we believe that these payment adjustments address policy concerns that are consistent with those that we originally expressed when we implemented the payment adjustment for LTCHs discharging patients that were admitted from co-located hospitals.

We also believe that it is important, once again, to note that the 3-year transition to the full 25 percent threshold payment adjustment will coincide with our continuing work on the MedPAC recommendations to attempt to develop facility and patient level criteria for LTCHs. We hope that the LTCH industry will work closely with CMS to pursue this endeavor during the transition period.

VI. Computing the Adjusted Federal Prospective Payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year

In accordance with § 412.525 and as discussed in section IV.C. of this final rule, the standard Federal rate is adjusted to account for differences in area wages by multiplying the labor-related share of the standard Federal rate by the appropriate LTCH PPS wage index (as shown in Tables 1 and 2 of the Addendum to this final rule). The standard Federal rate is also adjusted to account for the higher costs of hospitals in Alaska and Hawaii by multiplying the nonlabor-related share of the standard Federal rate by the appropriate cost-of-living factor (shown in Table 3 in section IV.D.2 of this preamble). In the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27827), we established a standard Federal rate of $38,086.04 for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year. In this final rule, as was proposed, based on the best available data and the policies described in this final rule, the standard Federal rate for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year will be $38,356.45 as discussed in section IV.C.3. of this preamble. We illustrate the methodology that will be used to adjust the Federal prospective payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year in the following examples:

Example

During the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, a Medicare patient is in a LTCH located in Chicago, Illinois (CBSA 16974). This LTCH is in the final year of the wage index phase-in, thus, the full (that is, five-fifths) wage index values are applicable. The full LTCH PPS wage index value for CBSA 16974 is 1.0751 (see Table 1 in the Addendum to this final rule). The Medicare patient is classified into LTC–DRG 9 (Spinal Disorders and Injuries), which has a current relative weight of 1.0424 (see Table 3 of the Addendum to this final rule).

To calculate the LTCH's total adjusted Federal prospective payment for this Medicare patient, we compute the wage-adjusted Federal prospective payment amount by multiplying the unadjusted standard Federal rate ($38,356.45) by the labor-related share (75.788 percent) and the wage index value (1.0751). This wage-adjusted amount is then added to the nonlabor-related portion of the unadjusted standard Federal rate (24.212 percent; adjusted for cost of living, if applicable) to determine the adjusted Federal rate, which is then multiplied by the LTC–DRG relative weight (1.0424) to calculate the total adjusted Federal prospective payment for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year ($42,258.45). (As discussed in section IV.C.5. of this preamble, for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, we are no longer applying a transition period BN offset (to account for the costs of the transition methodology) in determining the total adjusted Federal prospective payment.) Table 7 illustrates the components of the calculations in this example.

TABLE 7

Unadjusted Standard Federal Prospective Payment Rate	$38,356.45
Labor-Related Share	× 0.75788
Labor-Related Portion of the Federal Rate	= $29,069.59
Full Wage Index (CBSA 16974)	× 1.0751
Wage-Adjusted Labor Share of Federal Rate	= $31,252.71
Nonlabor-Related Portion of the Federal Rate ($38,356.45 × 0.24212)	+ $ 9,286.86
Adjusted Federal Rate Amount	= $40,539.57
LTC–DRG 9 Relative Weight	× 1.0424

TABLE 7—Continued

Total Adjusted Federal Prospective Payment *	= $42,258.45

*We are no longer applying a transition period BN offset to account for the costs of the transition methodology in determining the total adjusted Federal prospective payment for RY 2008.)

VII. Transition Period

To provide a stable fiscal base for LTCHs, under § 412.533, we implemented a 5-year transition period whereby a LTCH (except those defined as ''new'' under § 412.23(e)(4)) received a LTCH PPS payment consisting of a portion based on reasonable cost-based reimbursement principles under the TEFRA system and a portion based on the Federal prospective payment rate (unless the LTCH elected payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate). As discussed in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56038), we believed that a 5-year phase-in provided LTCHs time to adjust their operations and capital financing to the LTCH PPS, which is based on prospectively determined Federal payment rates. Furthermore, we believed that the 5-year phase-in under the LTCH PPS also allowed LTCH personnel to develop proficiency with the LTC–DRG coding system, which will result in improvement in the quality of the data used for generating our annual determination of relative weights and payment rates.

Under § 412.533, the 5-year transition period for all hospitals subject to the LTCH PPS began with the hospital's first cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2002 and extends through the hospital's last cost reporting period beginning before October 1, 2007. During the 5-year transition period, a LTCH's total PPS payment under the LTCH PPS was based on two payment percentages—one based on reasonable cost-based principles and the other based on the standard Federal prospective payment rate. The percentage of the LTCH PPS payment based on the LTCH PPS Federal rate increased by 20 percentage points each year, while the reasonable portion of the LTCH PPS payment based on cost-based principles decreased by 20 percentage points each year, for the next 4 fiscal years. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, Medicare payment to LTCHs will be determined entirely under the Federal rate.

In implementing the LTCH PPS, one of our goals was to transition hospitals to prospective payments based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal prospective payment rate as soon as appropriate. Therefore, under § 412.533(c), we allowed a LTCH (other than new LTCHs defined at § 412.23(e)(4)), which was subject to a blended rate, to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate at the start of any of its cost reporting periods during the 5-year transition period. Once a LTCH elected to be paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, it could not revert back to the transition blend.

VIII. Payments to New LTCHs

Under § 412.23(e)(4), for purposes of Medicare payment under the LTCH PPS, we define a new LTCH as a provider of inpatient hospital services that meets the qualifying criteria for LTCHs, set forth in § 412.23(e)(1) and (e)(2), and under present or previous ownership (or both), has its first cost reporting period as a LTCH beginning on or after October 1, 2002. As we discussed in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56040), this definition of new LTCHs should not be confused with those LTCHs first paid under the TEFRA payment system for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1997, described in section 1886(b)(7)(A) of the Act, as added by section 4416 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) (Pub. L. 105–33).

Under § 412.533(d), new LTCHs, as defined in § 412.23(e)(4), will be paid based on 100 percent of the standard Federal rate. As we discussed in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56040), the transition period was intended to provide existing LTCHs time to adjust to payment under the new system. Since these new LTCHs with their first cost reporting periods as LTCHs beginning on or after October 1, 2002, would not have received payment under reasonable cost-based reimbursement for the delivery of LTCH services prior to the effective date of the LTCH PPS, we did not believe that those new LTCHs required a transition period in order to make adjustments to their operations and capital financing, as will LTCHs that have been paid under the reasonable cost-based methodology.

IX. Method of Payment

Under § 412.513, a Medicare LTCH patient is classified into a LTC–DRG based on the principal diagnosis, up to eight additional (secondary) diagnoses, and up to six procedures performed during the stay, as well as age, sex, and discharge status of the patient. The LTC–DRG is used to determine the Federal prospective payment that the LTCH will receive for the Medicare-covered Part A services the LTCH furnished during the Medicare patient's stay. Under § 412.541(a), the payment is based on the submission of the discharge bill. The discharge bill also provides data to allow for reclassifying the stay from payment at the full LTC–DRG rate to payment for a case as a SSO (under § 412.529) or as an interrupted stay (under § 412.531), or to determine if the case will qualify for a HCO payment (under § 412.525(a)).

Accordingly, the ICD–9–CM codes and other information used to determine if an adjustment to the full LTC–DRG payment is necessary (for example, LOS or interrupted stay status) are recorded by the LTCH on the Medicare patient's discharge bill and submitted to the Medicare FI for processing. The payment represents payment in full, under § 412.521(b), for inpatient operating and capital-related costs, but not for the costs of an approved medical education program, bad debts, blood clotting factors, anesthesia services by hospital-employed nonphysician anesthetists or the costs of photocopying and mailing medical records requested by a Quality Improvement Organization (QIO), which are costs paid outside the LTCH PPS.

As under the previous reasonable cost-based payment system, under § 412.541(b), a LTCH may elect to be paid using the periodic interim payment (PIP) method described in § 413.64(h) and may be eligible to receive accelerated payments as described in § 413.64(g).

For those LTCHs that are being paid under the transition methodology set forth at § 412.533, for cost reporting periods that began on or after October 1, 2002, and before October 1, 2006, the PIP amount is based on the transition blend. For those LTCHs that are paid based on 100 percent of the standard Federal rate, the PIP amount is based on the estimated prospective payment for the year rather than on the estimated reasonable cost-based reimbursement. We exclude HCO payments that are paid upon submission of a discharge bill from the PIP amounts. In addition, Part A costs that are not paid for under the LTCH PPS, including Medicare costs of an approved medical education program, bad debts, blood clotting

factors, anesthesia services by hospital-employed nonphysician anesthetists and the costs of photocopying and mailing medical records requested by a QIO, are subject to the interim payment provisions as specified in § 412.541(c).

Under § 412.541(d), LTCHs with unusually long lengths of stay that are not receiving payment under the PIP method may bill on an interim basis (60 days after an admission and at intervals of at least 60 days after the date of the first interim bill) and this should include any HCO payment determined as of the last day for which the services have been billed.

X. Monitoring

In the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56014), we described an on-going monitoring component to the new LTCH PPS. Specifically, we discussed on-going analysis of the various policies that we believe would provide equitable payment for stays that reflect less than the full course of treatment and reduce the incentives for inappropriate admissions, transfers, or premature discharges of patients that are present in a discharge-based PPS. As a result of our data analysis, we have revisited a number of our original and even pre-LTCH PPS policies in order to address what we believe are behaviors by certain LTCHs that lead to inappropriate Medicare payments. In recent **Federal Register** publications, we have proposed and subsequently finalized revisions to the interruption of stay policy in the RY 2005 LTCH PPS final rule (69 FR 25692), and we established a payment adjustment for LTCH HwHs and satellites in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 49191 through 49214). In section V.A.2., we revisited the payment adjustment methodology established for SSOs (71 FR 27845) as a consequence of recent data analysis and are finalizing a policy which revises one of the existing four alternatives under the existing SSO payment methodology for certain SSO cases to an amount under the LTCH PPS that is comparable to an amount that would otherwise be paid under the IPPS.

As we discuss in section X. of this final rule, our monitoring of discharges between acute care hospitals and LTCHs reveals that a significant number of LTCHs that are ''freestanding'', that is, not co-located with other hospital-level providers (as defined in § 412.22(e) and § 412.22(h)), admit their patients from one specific acute care hospital. When we established the payment adjustment for LTCH HwHs and satellites of LTCHs at § 412.534, we stated our concern that these on-site LTCHs could be functioning as units of their host (generally, an acute care hospital), a configuration that is not permitted in section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act. (The statute specifically allows only for IRF and IPF units in acute care hospitals, but not for LTCH units.) As a result of our data monitoring and analysis, which is detailed in section V.B. of this final rule, we are expanding the existing payment adjustment at § 412.534 and we developed new § 412.536 to apply to certain situations not currently covered by the existing policy for LTCHs co-located with other hospitals.

As we discussed in the RY 2004 LTCH PPS final rule (68 FR 34157), the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) endorsed our monitoring activity as a primary aspect of the design of the LTCH PPS. Furthermore, the Commission pursued an independent research initiative that led to a section in MedPAC's June 2004 Report to Congress entitled ''Defining long-term care hospitals''. This study included recommendations that we develop facility and patient criteria for LTCH admission and treatment and that we require a review by QIOs to evaluate whether LTCH admissions meet criteria for medical necessity once the recommended facility and patient criteria are established (70 FR 24209). In response to the recommendation in MedPAC's June 2004 Report, we awarded a contract to Research Triangle Institute, International (RTI), on September 27, 2004, to conduct a thorough examination of the feasibility of implementing MedPAC's recommendations.

RTI has completed its examination of the feasibility of implementing MedPAC's recommendations in the June 2004 Report to Congress, and as discussed in section XI. of the preamble to this final rule. Both Phases I and II are posted on the CMS Web site (as noted below). We also reproduced the Executive Summary of the report in Addendum B of the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4884 through 4886). At that time, we noted, ''[t]his material is being reproduced as received from the contractors and does not represent out position or policy'' (72 FR 48181).

We are continuing to pursue our on-going program, existing QIO monitoring and studies described in the RY 2006 LTCH PPS final rule (70 FR 24211), and our considerations of expanding the QIO role in the LTCH PPS.

Comment: We received several letters from various Congressional delegations that were critical of the proposed revision to the SSO policy and the extension of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustments. The commenters stated that these policies do not achieve CMS' goal of identifying inappropriate LTCH admissions.

The commenters urged us to establish patient and facility-level criteria for LTCHs to better define the appropriate patient setting and medical conditions required for admission. A number of the commenters further stated that LTCHs admit patients only after applying an objective and rigorous set of admissions screening criteria and Medicare QIOs conduct post-admission reviews of LTCH patients to ensure that admissions are medically-necessary. These commenters further stated that at our direction, QIOs have been reviewing a sample of LTCH cases for admission appropriateness and that these reviews ''clearly'' show an immaterial number of LTCH claims denied as the result of QIO reviews. Therefore, the commenters maintained that QIO review data does not support our assumption that cases were inappropriately admitted to LTCHs, but rather, QIOs are overwhelmingly finding that LTCH patients have appropriately been admitted and treated in LTCHs.

Response: We reiterate that QIO review of Medicare cases, either based upon the national sample or resulting from specific appeals, presently determine, among other things, whether a patient required hospital-level care. The QIO reviews presently do not distinguish between acute care settings, such as acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS or acute care hospitals paid under the LTCH PPS. Therefore, although the QIO review process, as presently constituted, is a vital component of the Medicare program, the role played by the QIOs does not, at this time, provide a medium through which we can determine appropriate payment policy for acute care hospital patients who are admitted to an LTCH.

However, regarding the commenters' statement that the proposed rule did not target cases that are likely the result of inappropriate admission and that data available to CMS clearly showed an immaterial number of LTCH claims denied as the result of QIO review of a sample of LTCH cases, we would share the results of an LTCH review from FY 2005. In that review, QIOs reviewed a statistically valid, representative national sample of 1,392 LTCH claims annually for the past few years. These samples were utilized for calculation of national payment error rates and the sampling method has been determined to be statistically sound by external audit. While the overall numbers of admission denials is low due to the sample size, statistically-based projections have revealed issues relative

to inappropriate admissions, especially admissions with short length of stays. For discharges occurring during FY 2005, 7.9 percent of the admissions were found to be inappropriate accounting for a projected overpayment of $215,073,309 annually; this admission denial rate is higher than the 4.7 percent found for acute care hospitals paid under the IPPS during the same time period. Of note, 72.7 percent of admission denials for LTCH discharges occurred in claims with a LOS of 25 days or less.

The commenters further asserted that QIO data does not support our assumption that cases were inappropriately admitted to LTCHs as a result of LTCHs acting as extension sites or units of other acute care hospitals or patients receiving less than a full episode of care at the acute care hospital. However, an internal analysis of LOS for FY 2005 LTCH discharges has revealed that over 50 percent of stays were 25 days or less in length and many of those have an LOS comparable to an IPPS LOS for that DRG.

XI. MedPAC Recommendations: The RTI Contract

With the recommendations of MedPAC's June 2004 Report to Congress as a point of departure, RTI evaluated the feasibility of developing patient and facility level characteristics for LTCHs to identify and distinguish the role of these hospitals as a Medicare provider.

RTI completed this project in two phases. In Phase I, RTI prepared a background report summarizing existing information regarding LTCHs' current role in the Medicare system: their history as Medicare participating providers; the types of patients they treat; the criteria QIOs currently use to review appropriateness of care in these settings; and the types of regulations they face as Medicare participating providers. This work reviewed prior analyses of these issues and included discussions with MedPAC, other researchers, CMS, the QIOs, and the hospital associations.

In Phase II, RTI collected additional information on tools currently used by the QIOs and the industry to assess patient appropriateness for admission; analyzed claims to understand differences between hospital patients with outlier stays in non-LTCHs and those treated in LTCHs; and visited different types of hospitals to observe first-hand how LTCH patients differ from those in other settings and how this pattern varies in different parts of the country. RTI worked with different associations, including the National Association of Long Term Hospitals (NALTH), the Acute Long Term Hospital Association (ALTHA), the AHA, and the American Medical Peer Review Association (AMPRA), as well as several of the larger LTCH chains. The final report submitted by RTI summarizes these efforts and makes numerous recommendations to CMS regarding LTCHs.

As noted above, the reports on both Phase I and Phase II of RTI's research have been posted on our Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/LongTermCareHospitalPPS/02a_RTIReports.asp#TopOfPage.* Please note that this report does not represent our position or policy. We are currently evaluating RTI's recommendations regarding the feasibility of developing patient and facility level criteria from several standpoints. Most significantly, we have been concerned that several of RTI's recommendations may require statutory changes. Furthermore, even among those recommendations for action that would be accomplished on a regulatory level, there are many significant issues that require further analysis. RTI is proceeding with Phase III of their project and as during Phases I and II, we have consistently encouraged meaningful contact between RTI and industry stakeholders throughout this research phase of the contract.

Comment: We received a comment from MedPAC that urged us to continue working towards the development of patient and facility criteria as the best way to determine appropriate LTCH patients particularly in light of the RTI report which included recommendations similar to those originally suggested by MedPAC in its June 1994 Report to Congress. The Commission noted that approaches other than criteria, such as the 25 percent rule, ''may be administratively less complex but are more arbitrary and increase the risk for unintended consequences.'' The Commission further suggested that we evaluate patient criteria currently in use by LTCHs and continue to work with LTCH associations that have developed criteria. The commenter also reiterated the Commission's support for severity-rated DRGs for use in the IPPS hospitals and noted that their adoption could reduce necessity for referrals to LTCHs. The Commission also endorsed a larger role for QIOs in the oversight of determinations of medical necessity, as well as in monitoring compliance with patient and facility level criteria.

Response: We thank the Commission for its thoughtful response to our proposed rule. We are mindful of the importance of identifying patient and facility-level criteria for LTCHs and believe that we have contracted with RTI to continue moving in that direction as they begin Phase 3 of their project. The reports on Phase I and Phase II of RTI's work are posted on the CMS Web site. We believe that their analyses of LTCHs and other provider categories that treat LTCH-type patients provide the foundation for any future development of patient level criteria.

We understand MedPAC's preference for patient criteria as opposed to payment adjustments for the purpose of determining appropriate patients for treatment at a LTCH. However, we would note that even with the development of patient criteria, it continues to be our statutory responsibility, under the BBA and BBRA to provide for appropriate adjustments and to establish regulations as may be necessary to effectively administer the Medicare program by way of implementing appropriate payment policies and payment adjustments. Therefore, even though we continue our work with RTI in Phase 3 of their project to see if we can identify appropriate patient and facility-level criteria for LTCHs, we do not see the development of those criteria as contradictory aspects to efforts we have undertaken while performing our fiduciary responsibility for the Medicare program. We further believe that it may be appropriate to continue to maintain such policies under the LTCH PPS that guard the Medicare Trust Fund from duplicative payments for what is one episode of patient care, even if we are able to develop and adopt facility and patient criteria for LTCHs and LTCH patients.

In the following comment and response, we discuss our evaluation of existing patient criteria currently in use by LTCHs, including one that was developed by one of the LTCH associations.

The Commission's support for the adoption of severity-rated DRGs for use in acute care hospitals paid for under the IPPS is discussed in the FY 2008 IPPS proposed rule. As discussed in that proposed rule, we have also proposed adopting the same severity-based DRGs for the LTCH PPS.

Finally, regarding an increasing role for QIOs in the LTCH PPS, we are currently developing the next Quality Improvement Organization Scope of Work. These comments will be considered in that process.

Comment: Many commenters took issue with the payment adjustments that we proposed in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS proposed rule that would revise the existing SSO policy and extend the

scope of the 25 percent threshold payment adjustment. The commenters suggested that rather than issuing further regulations that do not reasonably address our most significant concerns with LTCHs, that we should instead focus on developing LTCH patient criteria as was suggested by MedPAC in 2004 and discussed in the RTI report. Several commenters further contended that we have been ''ignoring MedPAC and RTI recommendations.'' One commenter stated, ''In 3 years, CMS has not implemented MedPAC recommendations.'' Many commenters questioned why we have not adopted existing patient criteria instruments that are currently used by LTCHs, such as Interqual or the system developed by MassPRO and the National Association of Long Term Hospitals (NALTH).

Response: In responses to comments in the sections of this final rule that address the SSO policy and the extension of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment to LTCH and satellite discharges that were admitted from non-co-located hospitals, we specifically address our rationale for issuing both of these provisions. However, aside from objections to our policies, it also appears as if the commenters are combining the production of patient and facility level criteria by RTI with the end of further payment adjustments under the LTCH PPS by CMS. Notwithstanding the future development of appropriate patient and facility level criteria for LTCHs, it will continue to be our statutory responsibility under sections 1102 and 1871 of the Act to establish regulations as may be necessary to adjust LTCH payments appropriately and to effectively administer the Medicare program.

Furthermore, we strongly disagree with statements by the above commenters that we have ''ignored'' the MedPAC recommendations, as well as those recently resulting from RTI's final report. In awarding contracts, as a Federal Agency, we are required to follow the protocols of the Federal contracting process that are governed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) and Health and Human Services Acquisition Regulation (HHSAR) (5 U.S.C. 301 and section 205(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as amended (40 U.S.C. 486(c)) and regulations as follows: The Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR Ch. 1); FAR Supplements (48 CRFR Chs. 2–53); Labor (29 CFR, 41 CFR Ch. 50, Small Business Administration (SBA) 13 CFR, and OMB Circular No. A–130. Even after meeting all of the above requirements, however, we would note that while the MedPAC recommendations were originally published in June 2004, we were able to award the contract to RTI to evaluate MedPAC's recommendations by the start of FY 2005 (October 2004).

We have included an update of RTI's progress in each notice since that time, and we believe that an objective evaluation of the Phase I and II reports presently on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/LongTermCareHospitalPPS/02a_RTIReports.asp#TopOfPage* indicates steady progress but also demonstrates the thoughtful analysis resulting from RTI's high level of professionalism in pursuit of our goal.

RTI's work over the past 2.5 years has resulted in an extensive and careful analysis of the Medicare populations served by LTCHs, a comparison of these populations with those treated in other acute settings, including IPPS, IRFs, and Inpatient Psychiatric populations, as well as those treated in less intensive settings such as SNFs. This work included analysis of Medicare data to compare patient characteristics and provider costs for certain types of patients; regulatory requirements governing program conditions of participation for these different types of facilities; interviews with private sector developers of level of care determinations; and site visits and interviews with physicians and hospitals treating these typical and frequently overlapping populations.

The results suggested that, while there are distinctive populations with very long acute care needs, there are also many patients whose LOS at the LTCH may trigger a short stay outlier payment, suggesting their LOS was not consistent with an LTCH level of care need as defined by longer term acute level hospital care. While existing patient criteria such as Interqual are useful for distinguishing between the need for hospital-level treatment and a less intensive level, such as SNF care, RTI's analysis has determined that, in fact, the private sector criteria failed to distinguish between patients at LTCHs and patients at acute care hospitals. The criteria proposed by the National Association for Long Term Hospitals (NALTH) also had this shortcoming. While they identified the intensive acute care patient, they failed to identify differences between their admissions' clinical characteristics and those treated in a general acute care hospital step-down unit.

At a recent Technical Expert Panel (TEP) comprised of physicians, nurses, and hospital administrators representing, in addition to LTCHs, acute care hospitals, IRFs, and SNFs, convened by RTI, all participants agreed that LTCHs specialize in treating the types of patients they admit, noting that having a high volume of these patients is one of the reasons for their successful outcomes. However, it was also noted that these services are also provided in general acute care hospitals, particularly in ICU step-down units. So, while LTCHs may specialize in a select group of patients (the more intensively ill), they are not the only providers to successfully provide these treatments. The TEP reached consensus that volume was important for successful treatment of the complicated cases, regardless of site of care. TEP participants continue to be involved in providing feedback to RTI and another TEP is being planned based upon the earlier meeting and participant responses.

We continue to contract with RTI to work on these issues and RTI is presently involved into the next phase (phase III) of their project which will include the refinement of patient specific comparisons of total episode treatment in areas with and without LTCHs. Furthermore, RTI is also participating in the CMS-wide effort to better identify patient-level differences across the various levels of care.

XII. Payment for Direct Graduate Medical Education (GME)

A. GME Background

Section 1886(h) of the Act, as added by section 9202 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA) of 1985 (Pub. L. 99–272) and implemented in regulations at existing § 413.75 through § 413.83, establishes a methodology for determining payments to hospitals for the direct costs of approved graduate medical education (GME) programs. Section 1886(h)(2) of the Act, as added by COBRA, sets forth a payment methodology for direct GME costs involving the determination of a hospital-specific, base-period per resident amount (PRA) that is calculated by dividing a hospital's allowable costs of GME for a base period by its number of residents in the base period. The base period is, for most hospitals, the hospital's cost reporting period beginning in FY 1984 (that is, the period beginning October 1, 1983, through September 30, 1984). Generally, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 1985, Medicare direct GME payments are calculated by multiplying the hospital's PRA by the weighted number of full-time equivalent (FTE) residents working in all areas of the

hospital (and nonhospital sites, when applicable), and by the hospital's Medicare percentage of total inpatient days. In addition, as specified in section 1886(h)(2)(D)(ii) of the Act, for cost reporting periods beginning between October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1995, each hospital-specific PRA for the previous cost reporting period is not updated for inflation for any FTE residents who are not either a primary care or an obstetrics and gynecology resident. As a result, hospitals that trained primary care, and obstetrics and gynecology residents, as well as nonprimary care residents in FY 1994 or FY 1995 have two separate PRAs: one for primary care, and obstetrics and gynecology residents; and one for nonprimary care residents.

The Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP [State Children's Health Insurance Program] Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 (Pub. L. 106–113) (BBRA) amended section 1886(h)(2) of the Act to establish a methodology for the use of a national average PRA in computing direct GME payments for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2000, and on or before September 30, 2005. The BBRA established a ''floor'' for hospital-specific PRAs that is equal to 70 percent of the locality-adjusted national average PRA. In addition, the BBRA established a ''ceiling'' that limited the annual inflation update to a hospital-specific PRA if the hospital's PRA exceeded 140 percent of the locality-adjusted national average PRA. Section 511 of the Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–554) (BIPA) increased the floor established by the BBRA to equal 85 percent of the locality-adjusted national average PRA. For purposes of calculating direct GME payments, each hospital-specific PRA is compared to the floor and the ceiling to determine whether a hospital-specific PRA should be revised.

Section 1886(h)(4)(F) of the Act established limits on the number of allopathic and osteopathic residents that a hospital may count for purposes of calculating direct GME payments. For most hospitals, the limits are the number of allopathic and osteopathic FTE residents training in the hospital's most recent cost reporting period ending on or before December 31, 1996.

B. Residents Training in Nonhospital Settings

1. Background

For purposes of direct GME payments, since July 1, 1987, the statute allows hospitals to count the time residents spend training in sites that are not part of the hospital (referred to as ''nonprovider'' or ''nonhospital sites'') under certain conditions. Section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act requires that the Secretary's rules concerning computation of FTE residents for purposes of direct GME payments ''provide that only time spent in activities relating to patient care shall be counted and that all the time so spent by a resident under an approved medical residency training program shall be counted towards the determination of full-time equivalency, without regard to the setting in which the activities are performed, if the hospital incurs all, or substantially all, of the costs for the training program in that setting.'' (Section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act, as added by section 9314 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–509) (OBRA 86).) Regulations regarding the treatment of time spent by residents training in nonhospital sites for purposes of direct GME payments were first implemented in the September 29, 1989 final rule (54 FR 40286). In regulations adopted in that same rule at § 413.86(f)(3) (now § 413.78(c)), we stated that a hospital may count the time residents spend in nonprovider settings for purposes of direct GME payment if the residents spend their time in patient care activities and there is a written agreement between the hospital and the nonprovider entity stating that the hospital will incur all or substantially all of the costs of the program. The regulations at that time defined ''all or substantially all'' of the costs to include the residents' compensation for the time spent at the nonprovider setting. Before October 1, 1997, for IME payment purposes, hospitals were not permitted to count the time residents spent training in nonhospital settings. Section 4621(b)(2) of the BBA revised section 1886(d)(5)(B) of the Act to allow providers to count time residents spend training in nonprovider sites for IME purposes, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1997. Specifically, section 1886(d)(5)(B)(iv) of the Act was amended to provide that ''all the time spent by an intern or resident in patient care activities under an approved medical residency program at an entity in a nonhospital setting shall be counted towards the determination of full-time equivalency if the hospital incurs all, or substantially all, of the costs for the training program in that setting.'' In the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 41004 through 41005) at § 412.105(f)(1)(ii)(C) and § 413.78(d) (formerly designated § 413.86(f)(4)), we specified the requirements a hospital must meet to include the time spent by residents training in a nonhospital site in its FTE count for portions of cost reporting periods occurring on or after January 1, 1999 for purposes of both direct GME and IME payments. Section 413.75(b) redefined ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' as the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries and fringe benefits attributable to direct GME. Section 413.78(e) provides that, in order for a hospital to be permitted to count FTE residents training in a nonhospital setting, a written agreement must be in place between the hospital and the nonhospital site providing that the hospital will incur the costs of the resident's salary and fringe benefits while the resident is training in the nonhospital site. The hospital must also provide reasonable compensation to the nonhospital site for supervisory teaching activities, and the written agreement must specify that compensation amount.

2. Moratorium on Disallowances of Allopathic or Osteopathic Family Practice Residents Training Time in Nonhospital Settings, and Questions and Answers (Qs&As) on CMS Web Site (Section 713 of the MMA and § 413.78)

In order for the hospital to incur ''all or substantially all'' of the costs in accordance with the regulations, the actual cost of the time spent by teaching physicians in supervising residents in the nonhospital setting must be compensated by the hospital. The amount of supervisory GME costs is dependent upon the teaching physician's salary and the percentage of time that he or she devotes to activities related to the residency program at the nonhospital site. (We note that the teaching physician's involvement in the provision of patient care is not considered attributable to direct GME.) As long as there are supervisory GME costs associated with the nonhospital training, the hospital must reimburse the nonhospital setting for those costs to count FTE resident time spent in the nonhospital site for purposes of IME and direct GME payments.

Many hospitals have entered into written agreements with nonhospital sites that state that the teaching physician is ''volunteering'' his or her time in the nonhospital site, and, therefore, the hospital is not providing any compensation to the teaching physician. Other hospitals have paid only a nominal amount of compensation for the supervisory teaching physicians'

time in the nonhospital setting. Because § 413.78(d) requires that the hospital must incur ''all or substantially all'' of the direct GME costs, including those costs associated with the teaching physician, regardless of whether the written agreement states that the teaching physician is ''volunteering,'' we have required that the hospital pay these costs to count FTE residents training in the nonhospital site, as long as these teaching physician costs exist.

Section 713 of the MMA imposed a 1-year moratorium relating to certain nonhospital site teaching physician costs for the period from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. During this 1-year period, we were required to allow hospitals to count FTE allopathic or osteopathic family practice residents training in nonhospital settings for IME and direct GME payment purposes without regard to the financial arrangement between the hospital and the teaching physician practicing in the nonhospital setting to which the resident was assigned.

We instructed our contractors (formerly called ''fiscal intermediaries'' or ''FIs'') regarding the effect of section 713 of the MMA in the One-Time Notification (OTN), ''Changes to the FY 2004 Graduate Medical Education (GME) Payments as Required by the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA)'' (CR 3071, Transmittal 61, issued on March 12, 2004). Generally, we stated in the OTN that, when settling prior year cost reports during this 1-year period, or for family practice residents actually training in nonhospital settings during this 1-year period, contractors should allow hospitals to count allopathic and osteopathic family practice residents training in a nonhospital setting for direct GME and IME payment purposes without regard to the financial arrangement between the hospital and the nonhospital site pertaining to the teaching physicians' costs associated with the residency program. For further information on this provision and for a summary of comments and responses related to this provision, please refer to the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 49176).

Furthermore, in response to questions and concerns raised by the industry and Medicare contractors as to how to determine the costs associated with residency training at the nonhospital setting, as well as how and when to pay the nonhospital setting for these costs, we posted Qs&As on the CMS Web site on April 8, 2005 at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf.* In the Qs&As, in response to the question of whether there are situations where it is acceptable for the teaching physician to ''volunteer'' his or her time supervising residents at the nonhospital site, we stated that ''* * *'the relevant question is not whether volunteerism is permissible, but whether there is a cost to the nonhospital site for supervising the resident training. If there is a cost, the hospital must reimburse the nonhospital site for those costs.'' We further stated that we believe in situations where the teaching physician receives a predetermined compensation amount for his or her time at the nonhospital site that does not vary with the number of patients he or she treats, there *is* a cost for the teaching physician time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities. In contrast, if the physician's compensation at the nonhospital site is based solely on his or her billings, there is no cost for teaching physician time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities. Accordingly, the statute continues to require that a hospital must pay ''all or substantially all'' the costs of training residents at the nonhospital site to count FTE residents training at that site, including teaching physician costs, as long as those costs exist.

3. Requirements for Written Agreements for Residency Training in Nonhospital Settings (§ 413.78(e))

In implementing section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act, to assist contractors in determining whether a hospital incurred ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the program in the nonhospital setting, we required in § 413.78(c) and (d) (formerly § 413.86(f)(3) and (4)) that there must be a written agreement between the hospital and the nonhospital site stating that the hospital will incur ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of training in the nonhospital setting. We later specified at § 413.78(d)(2) that the written agreement must indicate the amount of compensation provided by the hospital to the nonhospital site for supervisory teaching activities.

In an effort to respond to concerns expressed by hospitals about the administrative burden associated with meeting the written agreement requirements, in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule (69 FR 49179), at § 413.78(e), we revised our regulations to allow hospitals to choose to either enter into a written agreement with the nonhospital site before the hospital may begin to count residents training at the nonhospital site, or to pay concurrently for the cost of training at the nonhospital setting. That is, in the absence of a written agreement, hospitals are required to pay ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the training program in the nonhospital setting by the end of the third month following the month in which the training occurs.

4. Modification of the Definition of ''All or Substantially All of the Costs for the Training Program in the Nonhospital Setting''

We have met numerous times with industry representatives with the goal of developing a proposal which would respond to the concerns expressed by the teaching hospital community about the administrative burden associated with determining and documenting that hospitals are paying for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs for the training in the nonhospital setting. Some industry representatives recently suggested that we could ease administrative burdens by modifying the requirements hospitals must satisfy to meet the statutory requirement to incur ''all or substantially all'' of the costs by allowing a teaching physician to attest that at least 90 percent of the teaching physician's GME *time* is spent in patient care activities. However, we explained in response that the statutory test is tied to whether the hospital has incurred ''all or substantially all'' of the *costs* of the training at that site, not to how the teaching physician's GME time is spent. Therefore, we do not believe the attestation proposed by the industry adequately addresses the statutory requirement that the hospital incur ''all or substantially all'' of the *costs* of the training program at that site. We continue to believe that any Medicare policy approach to allowing hospitals to count FTE residents training in nonhospital settings for IME and direct GME payment purposes must be consistent with the statutory requirement that hospitals incur ''all, or substantially all'' of the costs of a training program in a nonhospital setting. The statute is clearly concerned about the cost to the nonhospital site, and we believe the statute has set a priority to move resources, in terms of both residents and funding, out into community settings. Therefore, where there is a cost to the nonhospital setting for training residents, we believe that the Medicare program is obligated to ensure that the nonhospital settings receive the funding they are entitled to receive from hospitals under the statute.

Accordingly, we continue to believe that our current definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, which is based on the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, is true to the intent of the statute. However, to address the industry's concerns related

to burdensome documentation requirements, we are establishing an alternative methodology that hospitals may choose to use in determining and paying for the teaching physician costs attributable to direct GME in the nonhospital sites. As we explain below in this section, we are revising the current definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs to require hospitals to incur a percentage of the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site. This revision also generally incorporates the industry representatives' concept of a 90 percent threshold, but does not specifically relate it to the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician on nonpatient care direct GME activities, as suggested by industry representatives. Furthermore, as explained in more detail below in this section, in determining whether a hospital has met the 90 percent cost threshold, we are allowing hospitals to use certain shortcuts or proxies in the place of actual cost data specific to each teaching physician at each nonhospital site. However, hospitals would always still have the option of calculating the actual teaching physician costs and the 90 percent threshold using actual cost data specific to all, or some of their applicable teaching physicians. That is, even if a hospital chooses to calculate the direct GME costs of a program using actual teaching physician time and cost data (as under existing regulations) rather than using the proxies, under this revision, a hospital will only be required to pay at least 90 percent of the total of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the teaching physicians' costs attributable to direct GME for a program at the nonhospital site. That is, a hospital would no longer be required to pay 100 percent of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), plus the portion of the teaching physicians' costs attributable to direct GME at the nonhospital site. Instead, a hospital will be required to pay for 90 percent of the GME costs of a training program in a nonhospital site, and will have a choice between two approaches for calculating teaching physician's costs.

Currently, ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' is defined at § 413.75(b) as the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries and fringe benefits attributable to direct GME. We are defining ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' under § 413.75(b) (prospectively for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007) to mean at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to direct GME. We believe this standard is consistent with the statute, in that hospitals would still be required to incur ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of training programs in nonhospital settings, and we would expect this standard to further encourage hospitals to shift training to nonhospital settings as intended by the statute. Under this revised definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting, we will create a 90 percent threshold that hospitals must meet to count FTE resident time spent training at the nonhospital setting for IME and direct GME payment purposes. Additionally, under the new definition, hospitals will only have to incur a minimum of 90 percent of the costs of the program at a nonhospital site to count FTE resident time spent training at the site. Furthermore, as is the case with the current definition of ''all or substantially all,'' the new definition will not include overhead costs.

We solicited comments on our proposed effective date for purposes of both direct GME and IME as to whether our proposal should be effective immediately for portions of cost reporting periods occurring on or after July 1, 2007, or alternatively, for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. Although an effective date of ''portions of cost reporting periods occurring on or after July 1, 2007,'' provides a more immediate response to concerns raised by teaching hospitals, we had concerns that establishing new policies in the middle of hospitals' cost reporting periods may present some logistical challenges, both from an implementation and an audit perspective. Therefore, we proposed that the new definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs would be effective for both direct GME and IME for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007.

As we explained, rather than adopt the industry's suggested standard of 90 percent of the teaching physicians' time spent in patient care activities, which we do not believe would be sufficiently true to the requirements of the statute, as a compromise, we would accept that hospitals have incurred ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the program at the nonhospital site (and are therefore permitted to count the FTE residents training at the nonhospital site for IME and direct GME Medicare payment purposes) if the hospital incurs at least *90 percent of the costs* of training at that site. Under this revised policy, a hospital would not have to demonstrate that it has incurred the costs of the teaching physician's time if it has otherwise incurred at least 90 percent of the nonhospital site training costs by paying the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) during the time spent training at the site. However, if the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) account for less than 90 percent of the costs of training at the nonhospital site, the hospital would have to compensate the nonhospital site for its teaching physician costs so that the hospital is incurring at least 90 percent of the training program costs at the nonhospital site. If the hospital does not meet the 90 percent threshold by only paying for the cost of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), the hospital would have to meet the threshold by incurring some portion of the teaching physicians' salaries that is attributable to direct GME.

As previously stated in the Qs&As on the CMS Web site on April 8, 2005 at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf* (Answer #4), we believe there are typically no costs for teaching physician time if the physician's compensation at the nonhospital site is based solely and directly on the number of patients treated and for which he or she bills, which is the case with a solo practitioner. When the solo practitioner is not treating patients, he or she is not receiving payment for any other duties at the nonhospital site. Therefore, in this instance, there is no cost to the nonhospital site for the teaching physician's time. Thus the hospital has to incur only 90 percent of intern and resident salaries to meet the new regulatory requirements. However, in the case of a group practice or clinic setting, the physician often receives a predetermined payment amount, such as a salary, for his or her work at the nonhospital site. This predetermined payment amount reflects all of his or her responsibilities at the nonhospital site, including treating patients, training residents, and other administrative activities (as applicable), and he or she may receive that predetermined

payment from the nonhospital site regardless of how many patients he or she actually treats. The predetermined amount implicitly also compensates the physician for supervising residents. A portion of this implicit compensation is the cost attributable to teaching activities. Under current regulations, in order to count the residents training at that site, the hospital must pay the nonhospital site this amount. However, there may be instances in a group practice, where a teaching physician is not receiving a form of predetermined compensation for his or her work at the nonhospital site. For example, several physicians may work in the same office and share overhead expenses such as electricity and rent, but there is no sharing of revenues from patient care activities. Rather, the physicians operate as solo practitioners and are not compensated according to some predetermined arrangement. In cases such as these, we assume that the teaching physician is functioning as a solo practitioner and that teaching physician costs for GME training at the nonhospital site are zero. Accordingly, the revised policy being adopted in this final rule would more likely be applicable to members of group practices (or physicians in other arrangements) where the teaching physician receives a salary or other form of predetermined compensation for his or her work at the nonhospital site. However, we note that under the revised policy, in the case of solo practitioners, hospitals must continue to pay for at least 90 percent of the total cost of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits, including travel and lodging where applicable.

Comment: We received several comments noting the commenters' appreciation of the efforts CMS has devoted towards the issue of residency training at nonhospital sites and the belief that the proposed rule is a good first step in further improving the regulations regarding residency training at nonhospital sites. The commenters believe that by not requiring hospitals to pay for 100 percent of the costs of training at the nonhospital site and by allowing the use of proxies, the proposed rule may provide for considerable administrative relief.

Response: We appreciate the commenters' support of the proposed rule. We agree with the commenters and believe that the final rule will provide significant administrative relief and support the training of residents at nonhospital sites.

Comment: Several commenters maintained that the FY 1998 IPPS final rule (63 FR 40986 July 31, 1998), as well as a program transmittal A–98–44 from December 1998 stated that whatever reasonable amount was agreed upon by the nonhospital site and the hospital, that amount would be accepted as reflecting the costs of the nonhospital site.

Response: Although some may have read our previous guidance to suggest that the amount of payment for teaching physician costs in the nonhospital setting could be decided based solely upon negotiations between the hospital and nonhospital site that has not been our policy. As we indicated in the Qs&As posted on the CMS Web site on April 8, 2005 at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf*, to the extent that there is a cost associated with teaching physicians for the residency training program at the nonhospital site, according to statute and regulations, the hospital must pay ''all or substantially all'' of the cost.

Comment: Several commenters requested a return to the definition of ''all or substantially all'' that was in place prior to 1999, which did not include costs associated with teaching physicians in the nonhospital site. One commenter specifically stated that reversing the unintended consequences of the previous definition change was difficult and, likewise, ''Once in place, the costs of reversing this new rule and definition would be similarly difficult.''

Response: As explained earlier, we believe that our current definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting,'' which includes the GME portion of the teaching physicians' salary, is most consistent with the statutory language and legislative intent. Therefore, we are not returning to the pre-1999 definition of that term.

Comment: We received many comments regarding the effective date for our proposed policy revision. Some commenters believe that the policy revision should be effective for portions of cost reporting periods occurring on or after July 1, 2007 while others believe that the policy revision should be effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. One commenter asked that hospitals be able to apply the new method to any years where residents were disallowed. Other commenters requested that the proposed policy revision be effective retroactively to previous cost reporting periods.

Response: We solicited comments concerning the effective date of the proposed policy revisions. After carefully considering these comments, we have decided to finalize this policy revision to be effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. As we stated in the proposed rule, we are concerned that establishing new policies in the middle of hospitals' cost reporting periods would present burdensome technical and administrative difficulties, both from an implementation and an audit perspective. In addition, we do not believe that we have the authority to follow the commenters' suggestions to implement this provision retroactively. Section 1871(e)(1)(A) of the Act generally prohibits the Secretary from making retroactive substantive changes in policy unless retroactive application of the change is necessary to comply with statutory requirements, or failure to apply the change retroactively would be contrary to the public interest. Only in very rare cases do we apply a rule retroactively (for example, in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 where a retroactive change was clearly in the public interest). In those instances, we believed that the failure to apply regulatory changes retroactively would be contrary to the public interest because hospitals affected by the hurricanes could otherwise face dramatic financial hardship, which would threaten the stability of GME programs in the emergency area. In contrast, we do not believe that there is a compelling argument that demonstrates a degree of public interest that would justify applying this proposed policy revision retroactively.

Comment: Several commenters stated that they do not believe the proposed policy revision actually addresses the real concern that the hospital industry has with our current policy. These commenters believe the central issue is supervisory physician volunteerism in nonhospital settings. The commenters stated that volunteerism is historically endemic to physician education, and therefore, hospitals should not need to pay the costs of the supervisory physician when a physician is willing to volunteer as a supervisor. One commenter stated, ''We urge CMS in the final rule to issue a clear policy statement that volunteer status of faculty will be determined by the hospital and nonhospital site and that even physicians in group practices who are compensated a predetermined amount not based on patient billings may still be volunteering their teaching services.'' The commenter further stated that there is no cost for supervising residents in group practices since the physicians are making the same amount per year regardless of whether or not the teaching physicians are supervising residents. Some commenters believe

that since physicians are ''exempt'' from wage and hourly rules under labor law, there is no reason why the physician and the physician's employer could not agree that the physician's teaching responsibilities are undertaken voluntarily by the physician, do not lessen the physician's duties to the employer, and involve time besides the time that is necessary for the physician to meet fully his or her responsibilities to the employer. The commenters noted that the rules applicable to Federal government employers recognize that volunteer time, even in the course of usual business hours, is not compensated by the Federal government (*http://www.opm.gov/oca/leave/html/volunteer2.asp*).

Response: According to the statute, a hospital is required to incur ''all or substantially all'' of the costs for a training program at the nonhospital setting in order to count the FTE residents training in the nonhospital setting for GME payment. There is no reference in statute to other labor laws that might apply to physicians. Accordingly, our proposal only addresses the issue of determining costs of training programs in nonhospital settings. With regards to supervisory physician time, we address the issue of the costs to the nonhospital site for supervising the resident training. Our policy has been that if there is a cost, the hospital must reimburse the nonhospital site for those costs. If there are no costs, then no payment for supervisory physician time is required. Typically, there is a cost for teaching physician time. For example, there is a cost to the nonhospital site when the physician receives a predetermined compensation amount for his or her time at the nonhospital site that does not vary with the number of patients he or she treats. In contrast, there is typically no cost for teaching physician time if the physician's compensation at the nonhospital site is based solely and directly on the number of patients treated and for which he or she bills. The most obvious example of this situation would be a solo practitioner that serves at a nonhospital site. We note that the hospital is required to compensate the nonhospital site for the costs of the teaching physicians' time spent in activities in connection with an approved residency training program other than the supervision of residents while furnishing billable patient care services. That is, only the costs associated with teaching time spent in activities within the scope of the GME program, but not in billable patient care activities, would be considered direct GME costs that would need to be incurred by the hospital.

Comment: Generally, commenters were pleased that CMS is moving away from the requirement that hospitals need to pay 100 percent of the costs of training at nonhospital sites in order to comply with the statutory mandate of incurring ''all or substantially all'' of the costs. However, many commenters feel that the threshold for ''all or substantially all'' should be further reduced beyond 90 percent. Commenters stated that the threshold should be reduced to 75 percent in accordance with our interpretation of ''substantially all'' under the ''Stark'' provisions. One commenter stated that in addressing the ''Stark'' provisions, ''CMS requires 'substantially all of the patient care services of the physicians who are members of a group (that is, at least 75 percent of the total patient care services of the group practice members) must be furnished through the group * * *' '' In reference to whether these provisions conflict with the requirements under Stark, one commenter asked CMS to ''Please confirm in your commentary that a reasonable attempt to comply with the requirements to pay for the costs at nonhospital sites, whether it be under the written agreement standard or under the concurrent payment standard, using proxies or real costs, is considered by CMS to be in compliance with Stark law.'' The commenter further stated that if the action taken in the aforementioned sentence is not in full compliance with Stark law, CMS should make an exception under Stark for payments to nonhospital sites where the payments are made to referring physicians. Another commenter stated that ''* * * none of the key organizations involved in this issue have recommended such a [90 percent] standard. To be fair, the community did raise the question of preceptors attesting to 90 percent of their time being spent with residents in patient care * * * but we are unaware of any stakeholder group that has recommended 'substantially all' be defined as 90 percent of costs in the nonhospital setting.'' Other commenters requested that the threshold should be reduced to 75 percent because, as one commenter stated, ''Courts have also defined 'substantially all' as being 75 percent or greater in the context of corporate and securities law.'' Another commenter requested that the threshold be reduced to 60 or 70 percent because such a number would provide for increased flexibility at the local level, while another commenter believed that a threshold of 70 percent was more appropriate because it was more reflective of the reimbursement amounts hospitals receive from the government. A request was also made that the threshold be reduced to 80 or 85 percent.

Response: The statute requires hospitals to pay for ''all or substantially all,'' not just ''substantially all,'' of the cost of the training program in the nonhospital setting. We believe that in using the term ''*all* or substantially all,'' Congress' intention was that hospitals pay close to 100 percent of the nonhospital site GME training program costs (otherwise the ''all'' would add no meaning). As we described in the proposed rule, prior to proposing to revise the definition of ''all or substantially all'' to mean at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging if applicable) and supervisory teaching costs associated with direct GME, we had received a suggestion from industry representatives that hospitals should be considered by CMS to meet the statutory mandate to pay ''all or substantially all'' of the costs if the teaching physician can attest that he or she is spending at least 90 percent of his or her GME time in nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site. Since the issue is the cost associated with that teaching time, we did not agree with this suggestion. However, we continue to believe that a standard of 90 percent of the total costs is an appropriate interpretation of ''all or substantially all.'' In response to whether a reasonable attempt to comply with the regulations for residency training at nonhospital sites is considered to be in compliance with the Stark law, we believe that provided that the rate paid to the supervising physician is fair market value for the supervisory duties, the arrangement should not be inconsistent with the Stark law. Since both the use of proxies and actual data would be consistent with fair market value, we believe that this final policy conforms with the Stark law.

Comment: One commenter believes that we clearly stated in the proposed regulations at § 413.75(b)(2), § 413.78(f)(2) and § 413.78(f)(3)(ii) that a hospital only has to incur 90 percent of teaching costs. The commenter also believes that, although not restated in proposed regulations, the 90 percent threshold also applies to the requirements in § 413.78(f)(3)(i).

Response: We agree with the commenter that the 90 percent threshold also applies to § 413.78(f)(3)(i).

Comment: Many commenters stated that members of a group practice should be able to attest that they are volunteering and be viewed in the same manner as CMS views solo practitioners. Commenters also stated that it is more common for residents to train in group practice settings than with solo practitioners. One commenter stated business agreements vary among group practices and that, ''Compensation is based on patient volume and, in effect, each physician is a solo practitioner.'' Another commenter stated that for its specific nonhospital site, there is no additional payment made to a physician who teaches, nor is salary removed from a physician who does not teach. One commenter stated that although the commenter believes the proposed rule should not apply to solo practitioners, the commenter also believes that our logic is incorrect in determining why there are typically no teaching physician costs associated with solo practitioners and group practitioners that function as solo practitioners. The commenter stated, ''The fact that the physicians' compensation is derived solely from patient care revenues is not definitive in and of itself. Rather it demonstrates that the physician received no compensation for supervisory activities.'' The commenter further noted that, ''At a minimum, group practices should be permitted to rebut the 'implicit' compensation presumption by demonstrating that no portion of physicians' salaries is linked to resident supervision.'' Another commenter stated that teaching hospitals and nonhospital sites are in the best position to determine if there are any costs for training residents at the nonhospital site, and if so, how the costs should be compensated. The commenter stated that residents gain clinical experience while training at nonhospital sites. Therefore, the costs associated with their training are *de minimus* and if the group practice decides collectively that it is volunteering as a practice, it should be able to do so.

Response: As we have previously stated in the April 8, 2005 Qs&As and in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule ''* * * the relevant question is not whether volunteerism is permissible, but whether there is a cost to the nonhospital site for supervising the resident training. If there is a cost, the hospital must reimburse the nonhospital site for those costs.'' Therefore, if a teaching physician in a group practice is receiving a predetermined salary for his or her activities, and included in his or her activities are supervisory GME activities at a nonhospital site, then there is a cost associated with those activities. If teaching physicians that are members of a group practice can document that their circumstances are similar to solo practitioners in that they receive no predetermined salary and receive income solely from the patients they treat and the services for which they bill, the hospital may supply this documentation to the Medicare contractor during audit.

5. Implementation of a 90 Percent Cost Threshold

In revising the definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the program at a nonhospital site, and in establishing a 90 percent threshold, there are several variables that are important in the methodology for determining the minimum amount of training program costs that a hospital must pay in order to count FTE residents training in a nonhospital site. These variables are: teaching physicians' salaries, residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), the number of hours per week that the teaching physician spends in direct GME (not billable patient care) activities in the nonhospital site, and the number of hours that a nonhospital site is open each week. To provide the reader with a context for the new methodology, we will first explain the methodology briefly, provide two examples, and then proceed to an in-depth discussion of each variable (see section XII.B.5.b. of the preamble of this final rule).

a. Methodology

One of the primary complaints voiced by the hospital industry over the past several years is that our policy requiring hospitals to determine the portion of the teaching physician cost attributable to direct GME in the nonhospital site results in an untenable documentation burden since many physicians are reluctant to disclose their salary information to the hospitals. One solution to this problem suggested by the hospital industry is to use national average physician salary information as a proxy for teaching physician-specific salaries in the determination of the total cost of the program at a nonhospital site. In addition, since the cost of the teaching physician time that the hospital must incur is based on the amount of time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities, the hospital industry has been concerned that determining this GME time could require burdensome time studies. Therefore, we are adopting an alternative methodology that hospitals may choose to use, instead of actual costs, to calculate teaching physician costs in nonhospital sites. Using this alternative methodology, to facilitate a less burdensome way for a hospital to calculate the teaching physician costs associated with GME training at the nonhospital site, we are allowing hospitals to use 3 hours per week as a presumptive standard number of hours that a teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities at a particular nonhospital site. To determine the percentage of the average salary associated with the 3 hours the teaching physician is presumed to spend in nonpatient care direct GME activities, a hospital would divide 3 hours by the number of hours the nonhospital site is open each week. Next, the hospital would multiply this percentage of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities by the national average salary of that teaching physician's specialty to calculate the cost of the teaching physician's direct GME time. The cost of the teaching physician's direct GME time would then be added to the costs of the salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging expenses, where applicable) of the FTE resident(s) rotating in that program to that nonhospital site to determine the GME costs for that program at that site. (If FTE resident(s) are not rotating to a particular nonhospital site throughout a whole year, then the national average salary of the teaching physician would be prorated accordingly. The cost of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) would already be reflective of an FTE count). The hospital must pay at least 90 percent of these total GME costs for the program at that nonhospital site to count the resident(s) training there for direct GME and IME purposes. If the hospital is already paying all, or even a portion of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and if the amount that the hospital is paying for the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) is equal to at least 90 percent of the GME costs at the nonhospital site (that is, the 90 percent threshold), then the hospital would be considered to be incurring ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, and need not incur an additional amount for teaching physician compensation to be permitted to include the FTE residents training in the nonhospital site in its FTE count for purposes of direct GME and IME payments. However, if the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe

benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) does not equal at least 90 percent of the GME costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, then the hospital must incur an additional amount for teaching physician costs based on the national average salary information until it is incurring at least 90 percent of the GME costs for that nonhospital site program. That is, under the alternative definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, a hospital is required to incur at least 90 percent of the total GME costs for a particular program at a particular nonhospital site. The GME costs of a particular program at a particular nonhospital site consist of FTE residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging costs where applicable), and the portion of teaching physician compensation (which may be based on national average survey data) attributable to direct GME. As will be explained in more detail below in this section, the hospital always has the option of documenting the actual teaching physician's cost using actual time or salary information to pay at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the program at the nonhospital site. In summary, the formula for determining the 90 percent threshold, or the minimum amount that a hospital must pay for the GME costs of a particular program at a particular nonhospital site is:

0.90 × [(sum of each FTE resident's salary + fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable)) plus the portion of the teaching physician's compensation attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities.]

The portion of the teaching physician's compensation attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities may be calculated as follows:

(3/number of hours nonhospital site is open per week) × (national average salary for each teaching physician)*

* The number of teaching physicians included in this formula is subject to a 1:1 resident to teaching physician limit, as explained below in this section.

The following are two examples of the alternative methodology:

Example 1: Assume one teaching physician is supervising one FTE resident in a nonhospital site for one residency year. The national average published salary amount for that teaching physician's specialty is $120,000, and he works in a clinic that is open 60 hours per week. Using the standard of 3 hours spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities per week, the teaching physician spends 5 percent of his time in GME activities (that is, 3/60 = 0.05 or 5 percent). To determine the cost of the teaching physician's time, the hospital may make the following calculation: *$120,000 × 0.05 = $6,000.* This teaching physician's cost is added to the resident's salary and fringe benefits to calculate the cost of the training at the nonhospital site in the following manner: *$6,000 [cost of one teaching physician] + $60,000 [actual cost of the FTE residents' salary & fringe benefits] = $66,000.* To meet the new definition of ''all or substantially all,'' the hospital would be required to pay at least 90 percent of the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, which in this example equals $59,400 (that is, 0.90 × $66,000). Since in this case the cost of one FTE resident's salary and fringe benefits is $60,000, the hospital could reach the 90 percent cost threshold by simply incurring the resident's salary and fringe benefits during training at the nonhospital site.

Example 2: Assume one teaching physician is supervising one FTE resident in a nonhospital site for an entire residency year. The national average published salary amount for that teaching physician's specialty is $200,000, and she works in a clinic that is open 40 hours per week. Using the standard of 3 hours spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities per week, the teaching physician spends 7.5 percent of her time in GME activities (that is, 3/40 = 0.075 or 7.5 percent). To determine the cost of the teaching physician's time, the hospital may make the following calculation: *$200,000 × 0.075 = $15,000.* This teaching physician's cost is added to the resident's salary and fringe benefits to calculate the cost of the training at the nonhospital site in the following manner: *$15,000 [cost of one teaching physician] + $60,000 [actual cost of the FTE residents' salary and fringe benefits] = $75,000.* To meet the new definition of ''all or substantially all,'' the hospital would be required to incur at least 90 percent of the costs of the training at the nonhospital site, which in this example equals $67,500 (that is, 0.90 × $75,000). Since in this case the cost of one FTE resident's salary and fringe benefits is $60,000, the hospital has not met the 90 percent threshold by only incurring the resident's salary and fringe benefits. The hospital would have to incur at least an additional $7,500 of the cost (that is, $67,500 − $60,000) to reach the 90 percent threshold to be permitted to count the FTE resident for IME and direct GME purposes. Alternatively, the hospital could document the actual teaching physician cost using time or salary information specific to that teaching physician at that site, and use that amount to calculate 90 percent of the actual training program costs.

b. Explanation of Variables

In the following section, we discuss each variable in the methodology for determining the cost that a hospital must incur to count FTE residents training in nonhospital sites, and explain our rationale for employing each of these variables. As stated previously, the variables are: teaching physicians' salaries; residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable); the number of hours per week that the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care GME activities in a nonhospital site; and the number of hours that a nonhospital site is open each week.

(1) National Average Physician Salary Data by Specialty

One of the foremost objections voiced by the hospital industry to our current policy is the documentation burden associated with requesting salary information from individual teaching physicians in nonhospital sites. Hospitals believe that many teaching physicians in nonhospital sites are reluctant to disclose their personal salary information, yet this disclosure is necessary to enable the hospital to determine and pay the nonhospital site for the actual costs of the GME program in accordance with our current regulations. One suggestion mentioned by the hospital industry as an alternative to obtaining individual teaching physician-specific salary information is to allow hospitals to use national average salary survey data by specialty. We understand that there are a number of organizations that conduct annual national surveys on physician compensation. We proposed to allow hospitals to use physician compensation survey data as a proxy to determine the teaching physician costs associated with GME in a program at a particular nonhospital site. For example, one such national organization that collects data on physician compensation that we are considering using is the American Medical Group Association (AMGA). AMGA's *2006 Medical Group Compensation and Financial Survey* was performed under contract by RSM McGladrey. Founded in 1950, AMGA (formerly the American Association of Medical Clinics) is a trade association which dedicates itself to making the ''* * * multi-specialty medical group model the preferred delivery system for patient-centered, affordable, quality medical care in America,'' and represents 283 medical groups that include an average of 272 physicians. AMGA's use of the term ''medical group'' is based on the American Medical Association's definition of ''group practice,'' which is defined as a group that ''includes the provision of health care services by three or more physicians who are formally organized as a legal entity governed by physicians in which business, clinical, and administrative facilities, records and personnel are shared and the practice goals, objectives, and values are commonly defined. Income from medical services provided by the group

is treated as receipts of the group and is distributed according to some prearranged plan.'' AMGA has been performing surveys like the *2006 Medical Group Compensation and Financial Survey* since 1986. The 2006 survey was sent to over 2,600 medical groups, including medical groups that are not members of AMGA. To give readers an idea of the average compensation amounts in the survey, we have randomly selected 10 specialties included in the 2006 survey and listed their compensation information in Table 8. If we adopt the AMGA survey for use to determine the cost of teaching physicians' time attributable to GME, we would make the salary information for all specialties accessible to hospitals on our Web site and would provide it in a manner similar to Table 8.

TABLE 8.—PHYSICIAN SALARY INFORMATION

*Specialty	Mean salary (in dollars)	Median salary (in dollars)
Cardiology	411,916	363,081
Dermatology	336,531	306,935
Family Medicine	187,891	178,366
Gynecology and Obstetrics	286,418	271,273
Internal Medicine	192,264	183,840
Ophthalmology	307,044	281,112
Pediatrics & Adolescent: General	191,122	182,186
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	208,442	207,004
Diagnostic Radiology: Non-Interventional	415,521	400,000
General Surgery	331,970	310,736

*This information was obtained from the *2006 Medical Group Compensation and Financial Survey* published by the American Medical Group Association® (AMGA). For further information, visit AMGA's Web site at *http://www.amga.org/.*

We solicited comments as to whether we should use the mean or median compensation amounts for purposes of determining the teaching physicians' cost. In addition, although we recognize that there are generally geographic variations in salary amounts within each specialty (and, although not included in Table 8, AMGA does provide some detail of salaries by geographic area), we proposed to use the single national average or median salary amount for each specialty, rather than consider geographic variations, because we want to simplify and streamline the methodology for determining the GME costs in nonhospital sites as much as possible. We also solicited comments about whether AMGA's salary information should be used, and if not, which other physician compensation survey (or possible mix of surveys) would be more appropriate for this purpose, and whether we should consider additional factors such as geographic variation in physician salaries within each specialty. We noted that we believe it is important for the organization providing specialty-specific physician compensation information for this purpose to be one that is nationally recognized as an authoritative source. Additionally, we believe the data should contain compensation amounts for the fullest range possible of specialties and subspecialties, and should be issued annually so that hospitals will always have the most current data to use in determining the teaching physician costs in nonhospital sites. In addition, we would prefer a survey that is available to the public at no cost. (We understand that a number of these surveys are proprietary.) In addition, we solicited comments as to how to make the survey data available in the most efficient possible manner.

Regardless of the survey source that we ultimately use, we proposed that hospitals would use the most recent survey data available as of the beginning of the hospital's particular cost reporting year. For example—

- If residents are rotating to a particular nonhospital site to receive training in family practice in a hospital's cost reporting year beginning January 1, 2008, then the hospital would use the family practice average salary from the most recently issued survey (in the case of AMGA, 2007) as the salary cost of that teaching physician, even though that teaching physician may in fact earn more or less than that national average salary amount.
- If the teaching physician is a neurologist providing residents with neurology training in a nonhospital site in a hospital's cost reporting year beginning July 1, 2007, then the hospital would use the neurology average salary from the most recently issued survey (in the case of AMGA, 2006, since AMGA's surveys are typically released in August) as the salary cost of that teaching physician.

Comment: Numerous commenters suggested that in determining the proxy amount for teaching physician supervisory costs, hospitals should be able to use CMS's reasonable compensation equivalents (RCEs). One commenter, specifically stated ''The RCEs have been relied upon by CMS and its predecessor, the Health Care Financing Administration, for nearly 24 years as its measure of the reasonableness of physician compensation and, thus, those amounts should be used in this regulation as well.'' Furthermore, many commenters stated that if we choose to use AMGA data as its teaching physician salary proxy source, we would be requiring the use of data with values that ''substantially exceed'' what it considers to be reasonable under the RCEs. Some commenters view use of AMGA data, which produces physician salary amounts which are higher than RCEs as being ''arbitrary and capricious.'' Several commenters stated that if we choose not to use RCEs, we should use data from the AAMC's Faculty Salary Survey, which has an excellent response rate, can be made accessible to the public, and includes a ''broad range of specialties'' and as reported by one commenter, the AAMC's 2005–2006 survey report ''* * * includes data provided by all 125 accredited allopathic medical schools in the United States.''

In addressing whether hospitals should be able to use mean or median physician salary amounts in determining the proxy for teaching physician supervisory costs, several commenters requested that median salaries be used since medians are not affected by outlier data. Another commenter stated that since the salary amounts in AMGA's survey are not adjusted by the geographic area wage index, median physician salary amounts

should be used. One commenter stated that mean salary amounts should be used because using the mean salary would account for both range and frequency, while using the median would only account for frequency. Another commenter stated that for situations in which there is no salary information available for a certain subspecialty, we should consult with the AMA or AOA and encourage national data survey groups to start tracking data for these subspecialties.

Some commenters suggested that when available, hospitals should be able to use physician salary data that accounts for geographic variations including variations between rural and urban areas, while other commenters were opposed to using data that accounted for geographic adjustments because of the potential for added complexity. One commenter stated that hospitals should be allowed ''* * * to use a comprehensive source of locality adjusted physician compensation information as a proxy for actual compensation in determining non-hospital training costs.'' Another commenter stated that if we do not allow hospitals to account for geographic variations, we would be requiring that hospitals rely on national salary data which is inaccurate and make it necessary for hospitals to collect their own hospital-specific data. One commenter stated that since the goal of proxies was to simplify the process, there should not be more than one national salary amount for each specialty. Another commenter stated, that within specialties, the commenter ''* * * has not identified significant regional variations, and any large variation that might exist would be accounted for by simply using the median.'' Lastly, a commenter stated that in states such as Utah, using a national salary proxy amount would not account for the fact that physicians' wages are lower than in other parts of the country and, therefore, if Utah used the national salary proxy it would be paying more than 90 percent of the total costs of training residents at the nonhospital site.

Response: In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we solicited comments on what specific survey should be used as a proxy source in determining supervisory teaching physician costs. We also requested comments on whether we should consider geographic adjustments and whether we should use a mean or median salary amount. We appreciate the commenters' suggestions regarding what survey data should be used and whether we should use data adjusted for geographic variations, or use the mean or median salary point as the proxy for physician salary amounts.

In response to the commenters' suggestions that the proxy not be based on the AMGA data but rather be based on salary data used to establish Medicare's reasonable compensation equivalent (RCE) limits, we disagree with the commenters that the RCE limits would be an appropriate measure in the context of nonhospital site GME training programs. Although RCEs are appropriate as they are currently used in conjunction with other Medicare payment policies, we do not believe they are appropriate for use in determining a proxy for supervisory teaching physician costs in nonhospital sites. Currently, RCEs are only applied in the determination of reasonable costs of physician compensation in the few remaining types of facilities paid on a reasonable cost basis, the vast majority of which are not teaching hospitals. RCEs are not applied to the costs of any physician compensation in teaching hospitals that are paid under the IPPS. Thus, we do not believe RCE limits would represent an appropriate proxy to account for supervisory GME teaching physician costs in nonhospital settings. In addition, we note that under the RCE limits, exceptions are made for providers, such as small or rural hospitals, that may have difficulty recruiting or retaining physicians at the prescribed RCE level. As stated in the August 1, 2003 **Federal Register** (68 FR 45459) ''* * * if a provider is able to demonstrate to the intermediary its inability to recruit or maintain physicians at a compensation level allowable under the RCE limits * * * the intermediary may grant an exception to the RCE limits established under these rules.'' Since it may be difficult to recruit and retain physicians in rural nonhospital sites, we believe the use of RCEs as a proxy for the cost of teaching physician time in rural nonhospital sites could underestimate those costs since they are generally lower than market levels, or the AMGA salary amounts.

The updated RCEs published in the August 1, 2003 **Federal Register** (68 FR 45459), only include nine specialties. We do not believe the RCEs would provide the best representation of specialties for purposes of establishing proxies for supervisory teaching physician costs in nonhospital settings. In the August 1, 2003 **Federal Register**, we also stated, ''If no specialty category is appropriate (for example, in determining the reasonable cost for an emergency room physician), the intermediary will use the reasonable compensation equivalent level for the 'Total' category, which is based on income data for all physicians'' (68 FR 45459). The goal in using the physician salary proxy to determine supervisory teaching physician costs, for purposes of determining whether a hospital has met the statutory requirement to pay ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the training at the nonhospital site, is to allow the hospital to use a figure that reflects the physician's actual salary without having the administrative burden of determining the physician's actual salary. Since the RCEs only exist for nine physician specialties, it would be frequently necessary to use the ''Total'' category when salary information for a specific specialty is not available. This would be contrary to our goal of using a proxy which reflects the actual amount. For the reasons cited above in this section, we do not believe RCEs are the most appropriate source of physician salary data to use in the context of policies regarding supervisory teaching physician salaries in nonhospital settings; and therefore, we will not use them as proxies for supervisory teaching physician costs.

In response to the request that we use the AAMC's Faculty Salary Survey to establish proxies for supervisory teaching physician costs, we question the appropriateness of using the AAMC's data in the determination of a proxy since we note that several salary amounts in the AAMC data are close in value to that of the RCE amounts which, as we explained earlier, may not fully reflect total physician compensation amounts. As we explained above, we believe AMGA's survey data are extremely comprehensive and by making the necessary information available on our Web site, AMGA data would be easily accessible to the public. Therefore, we are finalizing our policy to use survey data published by AMGA as a proxy for physician compensation in nonhospital settings, and thus, in determining supervisory teaching physician costs. However, we will continue to monitor the various survey options and consider whether other data sources are appropriate for this purpose.

Since some members of the teaching hospital community have claimed that collection of actual data is burdensome, we are seeking, through the use of proxies, to make the calculation of supervisory teaching physician costs for GME training at the nonhospital site as straightforward as possible. Therefore, we believe that for each available specialty, only one national physician salary amount should be used. Further, we agree with many commenters that this physician salary amount should not be adjusted for geographic variation because doing so would add an

additional layer of complexity. In cases where no subspecialty salary amount is available in the AMGA data, hospitals should use the physician salary amount for the closest less-specialized form of that specialty. For example, as we proposed in the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule (72 FR 4824), ''* * * if residents are receiving training from a forensic pathologist, and the national average salary for the subspecialty of forensic pathology is not included in the physician compensation survey, then the hospital should instead use the national average salary for the specialty of pathology to determine the cost of that teaching physician.'' We also agree with the commenters' suggestion that median salary amounts should be used as the proxy physician salary amount since median salary amounts would not be influenced by outlier data. Therefore, we are finalizing the policy to require hospitals that choose to use the proxy method to calculate supervisory teaching physician costs to use AMGA's median physician salary amount for the required specialty.

Comment: One commenter stated that CMS should use average compensation figures for dental faculty based on specialty and regional variation. The commenter stated that the commenter would be happy to work with CMS to develop compensation figures for dental programs.

Response: While we appreciate the point raised by the commenter that the AMGA data does not apply to dental faculty, at this point we are unaware of a comparable data source for dental faculty salaries. We will work with the commenter to determine whether we can develop proxy salary amounts for supervisory dentists.

Comment: One commenter suggested that for added administrative simplicity in determining proxies, hospitals should be able to use ''* * * two 'blended' supervising physician salary amounts—'one for primary care and one for non-primary care * * *.'' These ''blended'' salary amounts would be determined using the published data source. The commenter stated that to determine which salaries should be included in the blends, a periodic survey could be taken to determine the composition of teaching physicians at each nonhospital site. Another commenter stated, ''We would also like to recommend that the CMS maintain as part of the final rule, the provision that allows providers to use actual teaching physician salaries for the calculation of the recommended cost threshold instead of the national average physician salary data by specialty.''

Response: We appreciate the commenter's innovative suggestion to use ''blended'' salary amounts in determining a proxy for supervisory teaching physician costs. However, in choosing a proxy for national physician salaries, in order to determine the teaching physician cost at the nonhospital site, we believe the proxy should be as close to the actual salary amount as possible. Therefore, we believe it is most appropriate for hospitals to use the published AMGA specialty salary amounts in determining the supervisory teaching physician costs at the nonhospital site. In response to the commenter's request that we maintain the option for hospitals to use actual physician salary information, we note that the proposal was to add a proxy calculation as an alternative to hospitals documenting that they have paid the actual teaching physician costs at the nonhospital site. Hospitals *always* have the option of using actual data instead of any of the proxies. We also note that under our revised policy, hospitals that use actual data are required to only pay 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of the teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities.

Comment: Several commenters questioned the potential availability of AMGA's survey data and requested that it be made available on our Web site. One commenter stated that AMGA charges a fee to access its data and if we are requiring hospitals to use AMGA data, the data, as well as information on AMGA's methodology should be made available without cost to the public on CMS' Web site. The commenter stated ''* * * because the AMGA survey and its methods are not freely available, providers may not easily be able to analyze and concur with AMGA's methodology or the amounts set forth in Table 8 * * *'' One commenter noted that since there is a fee to access AMGA data, using that data or other similar data (which requires a fee) would be inappropriate because we would be imposing additional costs on GME. The commenter further noted (referring to AMGA's data), ''It is not clear how representative of all practicing physicians these respondents are.''

Response: We will make available any physician specialty salary survey data that is needed to compute teaching physician supervisory costs available free of charge on our Web site. Additionally, we will consider posting information on the AMGA's survey methodology. By posting the AMGA data on our Web site, we are not imposing any additional cost on GME training that occurs at nonhospital sites. Since AMGA's survey data will be posted free of charge, we do not believe there will be any costs associated with accessing the necessary data.

We disagree with the commenter regarding the level of physician salary representation in AMGA's survey. AMGA's survey includes a range of physician specialty salaries. In fact, because of the broad range of specialties included in the survey we believe AMGA's survey data are particularly appropriate for use to establish a proxy for teaching physician salaries and well-suited to meet our goal to use salary information that reflects physicians' actual salaries.

Comment: One commenter asked whether a provider could use an alternative survey similar to AMGA if it can demonstrate that the survey was compiled in a similar manner. Another commenter stated that in determining the proxy salary amounts to be used, we should ''* * * consider the approach used by the Department of Veterans Affairs in setting salaries for its physicians, notably by employing multiple surveys of physician compensation.''

Response: In response to the commenters' question of whether a survey similar to AMGA's could be used as a proxy source or a combination of surveys, in establishing the proxy, we are allowing a hospital to base its determination on either AMGA survey data or actual physician salary amounts. However, as previously mentioned, we will continue to consider the appropriateness of using other options for sources of physician salary data.

Determining Teaching Physicians' Cost

In determining the teaching physicians' cost, the specialty of the teaching physician is the relevant criterion, not the specialty of the residents that the teaching physician is training in the nonhospital site. Generally, we believe the specialty of the teaching physician will be self-evident, and the hospital can easily locate the national average salary information for that teaching physician's specialty on the survey (for example, if family practice residents are rotating to a dermatology practice to receive training in dermatology, then the national average salary for dermatologists would be used from the survey). However, it is possible that the teaching physician is highly specialized and the average compensation for his or her subspecialty is not listed in the survey we decide to use. In such a case,

we proposed that the hospital should use the immediately less-specialized form of that specialty applicable to that teaching physician (or the hospital may use the physician's actual salary information). For example, if residents are receiving training from a forensic pathologist, and the national average salary for the subspecialty of forensic pathology is not included in the physician compensation survey, then we proposed that the hospital should instead use the national average salary for the specialty of pathology to determine the cost of that teaching physician. We believe this is the simplest method of assigning a national average physician compensation amount in the instance where the teaching physician's actual subspecialty is not included in the survey. However, we solicited comments as to whether it is possible or appropriate to use survey data from other sources in the event that data is not available from the particular survey source.

In addition, although it may not be a common occurrence, it is possible that residents could be receiving training in a nonhospital site from a teaching physician that is board certified in more than one specialty, but the residents are only receiving training in one of the specialties in which the physician is board certified. In this case, we proposed that the national average salary that should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost should be the one for the specialty in which the teaching physician is training the residents. For example, if residents are being supervised by a cardiologist who is board certified in internal medicine and cardiology, but the residents are training with him or her specifically to learn internal medicine, then we proposed that the hospital should use the national average salary for internal medicine, and not cardiology, to determine the teaching cost of that physician. That is, in instances where the residents are receiving training at a nonhospital site from a teaching physician that is board certified in more than one specialty, and it is unclear which specialty to use for purposes of assigning a national average salary to that physician, we proposed that the question for the hospital to ask is, why are the residents training with that physician? If the answer is, ''to receive training in Specialty X,'' then the national average salary amount for Specialty X should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost. If the answer is, ''to receive training in Specialty Y,'' then the national average salary amount for Specialty Y should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost, regardless of the specific board certification that the teaching physician has actually received. In general, the hospital, with assistance from the GME Program Director as necessary, should be able to document for the Medicare contractor the specialty in which the residents are receiving training at the nonhospital site, and the national average physician compensation amount for that specialty used in paying ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, as defined in this final rule.

Comment: A commenter stated that the specialty of the resident and not of the teaching physician should be used in determining the specific salary proxy. The commenter provided the example that a cardiologist will teach an internal medicine resident what he or she is required to know regarding heart disease and the cardiovascular system as an internist and not a cardiologist. The commenter further requested that we ''* * * clearly state that proxy salaries for *subspecialty* physicians originally trained in the specialty of the residents they are teaching be set to the salary of *specialists* in the residents' field regardless of the certification status of the faculty person.''

Response: In response to the commenter's request that the specialty of the resident be used in determining the supervisory teaching physician cost, we stated in the proposed rule * * * that the national average salary that should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost should be the one for the specialty in which the teaching physician is training the residents.'' For example, if a resident happens to be supervised by a physician who is board certified in internal medicine and cardiology, but the resident is training with him or her specifically to learn general internal medicine, then we proposed that the hospital should use the national average salary for internal medicine, and not cardiology, to determine the teaching cost of that physician. However, if the internal medicine resident is at the nonhospital site to receive cardiology training as part of his or her 3-year internal medicine program, the salary for cardiologists should be used. In instances where the residents are receiving training at a nonhospital site from a teaching physician that is board certified in more than one specialty, and it is unclear which specialty to use for purposes of assigning a national average salary to that physician, we proposed that the question for the hospital to ask is, why are the residents training with that physician? If the answer is, ''to receive training in X,'' then the national average salary amount for Specialty X should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost. If the answer is, ''to receive training in Y,'' then the national average salary amount for Specialty Y should be used to determine the teaching physician's cost, regardless of the specific board certification that the teaching physician has actually received. We believe the teaching physician supervisory cost should reflect the value of the training received as it relates to the training the resident is receiving. Therefore, we are not adopting the commenter's suggestion to use the physician salary of the specialty program of the resident regardless of the specifics of the training received.

Multiple Teaching Physicians and Residents: 1:1 Resident to Teaching Physician Ratio

We understand that it is not unusual for several residents in the same program to rotate to a particular nonhospital site at the same time, and be supervised by one teaching physician, or for residents to be supervised by several teaching physicians during their time at that nonhospital site. In determining the total costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, it is necessary to consider all of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the teaching physicians' national average salaries. However, to maintain administrative simplicity, we are allowing hospitals to apply a maximum of a 1:1 resident-to-teaching physician ratio ''limit'' in determining the total GME costs applicable to a program at a nonhospital site. For example, if at the nonhospital site there are two teaching physicians and one FTE resident, the hospital may determine 90 percent of the total costs of the program using a 1:1 resident-to-teaching physician ratio, not a 1:2 resident-to-teaching physician ratio. The 90 percent threshold would be based on the total cost of the one FTE resident (salary and fringe benefits, and travel and lodging where applicable) and one teaching physician (national average salary for the specialty multiplied by the percentage of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities). Similarly, if a hospital rotated 3 FTE residents in the same program to a particular nonhospital site with 7 physicians, unless the hospital documents otherwise, we would assume that all 7 physicians supervise the residents at some point during the training, but, for purposes of determining the 90 percent threshold, we assume that there are only 3 FTE residents being supervised by 3 teaching

physicians. Accordingly, the 90 percent threshold would be based on the total cost of the 3 FTE residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and 3 teaching physicians (national average salaries for the specialties multiplied by the percentage of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities). (In addition, we note that the 1:1 limit may be applied to FTE fractions, as well. That is, if in the preceding example, 3.5 FTE residents were being supervised by 7 physicians, the 90 percent threshold would be determined based on the costs associated with a resident-to-teaching physician ratio of 3.5:3.5.)

In the case of multiple teaching physicians, we must also consider that a particular nonhospital site may be staffed by physicians in different specialties. For example, an orthopedics practice may include orthopedists and radiologists. In this case, we would still maintain the 1:1 resident-to-teaching physician limit, even if the teaching physicians are in different specialties, unless the hospital can document that the number of physicians actually teaching the residents is less than the number of FTE residents training at that nonhospital site. Once the number of teaching physicians is established, the hospital would determine the national average salary for each of those teaching physicians from the national survey data, and then calculate the average national salary of the mix of physician specialties in the practice to be used in computing the 90 percent threshold. For example, assume that 3 FTE residents are rotating to an orthopedic surgery practice staffed by a total of 7 physicians; 4 are orthopedic surgeons, and 3 are diagnostic radiologists. Again, unless the hospital documents otherwise, we would assume that all 7 physicians supervise the residents at some point during their rotation to this practice. First, the hospital would access the national average salary for orthopedic surgeons (assume $400,000), and the national average salaries for diagnostic radiologists (assume $412,000). Then, the hospital would calculate the average salary for these physicians as follows: [($400,000 × 4) + ($412,000 × 3)]/7 = $405,143. Next, the 1:1 resident-to-teaching physician ratio would be applied, such that for purposes of determining the 90 percent threshold, there would be 3 FTE residents and 3 teaching physicians. Since the 3 teaching physicians are not in the same specialty, the hospital would multiply the average salary cost of $405,143 by 3 to get the total teaching physician salaries for the training program at that site ($405,143 × 3 = $1,215,429). The hospital would then multiply $1,215,429 by the percentage of time spent by the teaching physicians in nonpatient care direct GME activities (that percentage is 3 hours divided by the number of hours the practice is open during a week) to determine the teaching physician GME cost for the training program at that site. This teaching physician cost is then added to the salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) of the 3 FTE residents to determine the GME cost of the program at that practice, and the hospital must ensure that it incurs at least 90 percent of that GME cost to count the 3 FTE residents training at the nonhospital site.

We note that, as we indicated above in this section, if there are several physicians in a nonhospital site, we would assume that they all supervise the residents at some point during the residents' training. However, it may be that in fact only some of the physicians actually supervise the residents, while other physicians are not involved in the training program at all. The hospital may wish to document that only certain physicians are involved in the training program (to more accurately represent the structure and costs of the training program in a particular nonhospital site). Such documentation would increase the number of residents relative to teaching physicians that is used to calculate the teaching physician costs. That is, using the example above where the resident-to-teaching physician limit was presumed to be 3:3, since there were actually 3 FTE residents and 7 physicians, if the hospital can document that only 2 physicians supervised the residents (and the other 5 physicians were not involved in the GME program at all), then the resident-to-teaching physician ratio would be 3:2. As a result, the hospital might be required to incur less teaching physician costs, if any, to meet the 90 percent threshold.

Comment: One commenter stated that in using a 1:1 ratio in determining the 90 percent threshold, it is unlikely that a hospital will meet the 90 percent threshold because physician salaries are quite a bit higher than resident salaries and fringe benefits particularly among specialties. Commenters also asked what documentation we are requiring to show that only certain teaching physicians at nonhospital sites are supervising residents. One commenter asked that we confirm that this information should be provided after the resident rotation to the nonhospital site has occurred.

Response: We proposed to adopt the 1:1 ratio so that there would be an upper limit on the number of physicians that are supervising residents in the nonhospital site. We believe that use of a 1:1 ratio greatly *reduces* the cost a hospital would have to pay when there is actually a higher teaching physician to resident ratio. For example, if two teaching physicians were supervising one resident, in the absence of the 1:1 ratio, the costs for both of those teaching physicians would be included for purposes of making the ''all or substantially all'' calculation. Thus, hospitals could be required to pay significantly more of the physician salaries if the teaching physician to resident ratio is not capped at 1:1. The 1:1 cap does not apply to the number of residents (and thus the resident salary and fringe benefit calculation). Therefore, where there is one teaching physician training three residents, the hospital would calculate teaching physician costs using one teaching physician salary and all three of the residents' salary and fringe benefit data. In response to the commenters' request that we advise what type of documentation hospitals need to submit to show that only certain teaching physicians are supervising residents, the hospital should have the teaching physicians that were not involved in the training submit documentation at the end of the rotation or by the end of the applicable academic year (June 30) to indicate that they were not involved, either directly, or indirectly, with the education of residents in their practice. Alternatively, those physicians involved in the training can be identified in the written agreement, or the hospital may submit contemporaneous documentation from the GME program director specifying which physicians were involved in supervising the residents.

(2) Residents' Salaries and Fringe Benefits

The second variable in our methodology for determining the costs of a program at a nonhospital site is the salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) of the FTE residents that are rotating to a particular nonhospital site. We understand that since the salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) of most residents are already paid by hospitals (either directly, or by reimbursing another entity such as a medical school), the portion of the actual cost of the residents attributable to training in the nonhospital setting can be easily identified and documented by a

hospital. Therefore, as under existing regulations, in determining the 90 percent threshold for a particular program at a specific nonhospital site, the hospital must use the actual cost of each FTE resident's salary and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable). In addition, the cost of the residents will vary by specialty and by program year. Furthermore, as with current policy, the total residents' costs will be based on the FTE number rotating to a particular nonhospital site in a cost reporting period, not the number of individuals actually training in a nonhospital site.

Comment: Several commenters requested that we specify what is included in resident salaries and fringe benefits. Several commenters also requested that we specify that resident malpractice insurance is included in resident fringe benefits.

Response: It is not our intent to cause hospitals to modify their human resources policies regarding residents' salaries and fringe benefits. Hospitals should maintain their definition of residents' salaries and fringe benefits that was in place *prior* to the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule. Hospitals should not include resident malpractice insurance or other costs in residents' fringe benefits solely for the purpose of increasing the total cost of residents' salaries and fringe benefits and minimizing the portion of teaching physician costs they have to pay. Furthermore, we note that historically, malpractice costs were not to be included in the intern and resident cost center on the cost report. Accordingly, malpractice costs should not be included as a fringe benefit in the calculation of the 90 percent threshold.

Comment: One commenter was concerned about our requirement that a hospital must use *the actual costs* of each FTE resident's salary and fringe benefits as one of the variables under the proposed methodology for determining the minimum amount that a hospital must pay to count FTE residents training in a nonhospital site. The commenter stated that under our current policy, a hospital only needs to know in general that it incurred the costs of residents' salaries and fringe benefits, but need not know the actual amounts paid; whereas under the proposed methodology, a hospital would have the significant administrative burden knowing the precise program year and corresponding salary and fringe benefits amount for each resident that trains in the nonhospital setting. The commenter suggested that we allow hospitals the option of using an average salary plus fringe benefit amount as a means of simplifying the proposed methodology and to provide administrative relief for hospitals.

Response: In the RY 2008 LTCH PPS proposed rule, we stated that we would allow a hospital to use physician compensation survey data as a proxy to determine the teaching physician costs associated with a program at a particular nonhospital site. We proposed to allow the hospital to use a proxy amount because hospitals stated that the existing regulation was administratively burdensome since many teaching physicians in nonhospital sites are reluctant to disclose their personal salary information. We proposed this policy because teaching physicians in a nonhospital site may not be employed or paid by the hospital, and hospitals indicated they had great difficulty establishing the teaching physicians' salaries and the portion of the cost attributable to the nonpatient care direct GME activities of the teaching physicians.

In contrast, we believe resident salary and fringe benefits amounts are more readily available to hospitals since they ordinarily pay these costs directly. Because hospitals have ready access to this data, we believe it is appropriate that hospitals use the actual costs of resident salaries and fringe benefits for the calculation of the 90 percent threshold, rather than some sort of proxy.

The commenter is correct that to calculate the actual resident salary and fringe benefits amounts, hospitals will have to take into account the actual salary and fringe benefits for each FTE resident that trains in the nonhospital site, which may vary by resident.

Comment: Several commenters inquired about which travel and lodging expenses should be considered as applicable to direct GME in the nonhospital site.

Response: Residents' fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) are considered a part of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting.'' The only travel and lodging costs that are applicable are the additional travel and lodging costs that a hospital incurs due to the fact that a resident is training at a nonhospital site. For example, if a resident needs to travel long distance to another part of the state, and is staying in a hotel for the duration of the nonhospital site training, the costs of the traveling and accommodations would be costs that the hospital must incur and include in the determination of the 90 percent threshold. However, expenses that are normally incurred when the resident trains at or nearby the hospital, such as commuting and living expenses, would not be applicable.

(3) The Number of Hours Spent in Nonpatient Care Direct GME Activities in a Week and the Number of Hours That the Nonhospital Site is Open in a Week

The third variable used in the determination of the costs of a training program at a nonhospital site is the amount of time that the teaching physician(s) spends on direct GME (nonpatient care) activities in a week. As we first explained in the July 31, 1998 **Federal Register** (63 FR 40987), and more recently in the August 8, 2005 Qs&As posted on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf*, determination of the teaching physician costs to the nonhospital site is dependent upon the teaching physician's salary and the percentage of time he or she devotes to activities related to non-billable direct GME activities at the nonhospital site (such as conferences, practice management, lectures, and administrative activities like resident evaluations). Hospitals and teaching physicians have protested that documenting the percentage of time that teaching physicians spend on activities relating to nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site is an onerous and impractical task. In an effort to eliminate the documentation burden on physicians of keeping track of the amount of time they spend in nonpatient care direct GME activities in the nonhospital site, rather than require teaching physicians to estimate the number of hours per week that they spend in such activities with or on behalf of the residents, we proposed an alternative option that hospitals may choose to use to determine the percentage of the teaching physician's time that is spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities. This option is an administrative shortcut or a proxy, rather than continuing to require in all cases that the hospital must document and pay for the actual costs of a training program at a nonhospital site. However, a hospital always has the option of documenting and paying for at least 90 percent of the costs of a program at a nonhospital site using the teaching physician's actual salary and information on the time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities.

Under the proxy methodology, we would apply a presumed standard number of hours spent by teaching physicians in nonpatient care direct

GME activities in every nonhospital site. Specifically, we proposed to use a standard of 3 hours per week spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities by teaching physicians. The 3 hour standard would be used in all cases in the formula for determining the teaching physician costs at *all* nonhospital sites, regardless of the specialty of the residents or the number of teaching physicians or residents training at that nonhospital site. Although some hospital industry representatives have stated that the amount of time spent by teaching physicians in nonpatient care direct GME activities in nonhospital sites is ''de minimus,'' and, therefore, there is typically little if any teaching cost to the nonhospital site, we believe there is also evidence indicating that in many cases the teaching physician is spending a significant amount of time with or on behalf of the residents in nonpatient care direct GME activities. We believe the standard of 3 hours of nonpatient care direct GME activities per week is a reasonable proxy based on data collected from surveys conducted by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), the American Osteopathic Association (AOA), and the Academic Family Medicine Advocacy Alliance (AFMAA), in addition to information compiled from our own informal surveys of teaching physicians.

In September 2005, in response to a request by CMS, the AFMAA, AOA, and AAMC conducted informal surveys to determine the amount of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities by teaching physicians in nonhospital sites. In the survey results shared with CMS by these associations, we received a range of hours for the amount of teaching physician time spent per week in nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site. Such nonpatient care GME time included time spent by the teaching physician in training activities when the patient was not present and time spent in administrative activities related to the GME program. The surveys showed means ranging from 1.1 to 4.0 hours per week and medians of 1.5 to 4.0 hours per week for time spent on residency training when patients were not present. The surveys also showed means ranging from 1.6 to 4.7 hours per week and medians of 0 to 2 hours per week for time spent on administrative activities related to residency training at the nonhospital site. Given the range of survey results, we believe that 3 hours per week serves as a reasonable number to use as a shortcut or a proxy for determining teaching physician time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site. As previously stated, hospitals always still have the option of calculating teaching physician costs and the 90 percent cost threshold using actual data (as under current regulations) specific to the number of hours the teaching physician spends per week on nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site. For example, if a hospital can document that a teaching physician actually spends 1.5 hours per week on nonpatient care direct GME activities at the nonhospital site, then the hospital may use 1.5 hours per week in calculating the teaching physician cost and the 90 percent cost threshold.

We proposed to use the standard of 3 hours of nonpatient care direct GME activities per week as the proxy regardless of the number of FTE residents the teaching physician is supervising because we believe that when the number of FTE residents at a nonhospital site increases, the teaching physician time associated with those FTE residents in many instances will increase by only a small multiple. For example, a teaching physician would provide a lecture to the residents together, rather than separately lecturing each FTE resident who is training at the nonhospital site. Accordingly, the time spent by the teaching physician in nonpatient care direct GME activities may increase only slightly with each additional FTE resident being supervised.

While we proposed to use the standard number of hours spent by teaching physician(s) in nonpatient care direct GME activities across all training occurring at all nonhospital sites (that is, 3 hours per week), we are introducing a fourth variable in the determination of the cost of a training program in a nonhospital site that will vary depending on the specific nonhospital site. This fourth variable is the number of hours that a nonhospital site is open each week. Since only a percentage of the teaching physician's salary is attributable to direct GME activities, and that percentage is based on time he or she devotes to activities related to non-billable direct GME activities at the nonhospital site, we are determining this percentage by dividing the standard number of hours spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities by the number of hours the *specific* nonhospital site is open each week. We proposed that the numerator will always be 3 hours, and the denominator will vary depending on the nonhospital site. For example, if FTE residents rotate throughout the year to a nonhospital site that is open 40 hours per week, then the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician(s) in nonpatient care direct GME activities throughout the year at that site is $\frac{3}{40} = 0.075$ or 7.5 percent. (If FTE residents rotate to that nonhospital site for only a portion of a year, then the ratio of $\frac{3}{40}$ would be further multiplied by the percentage of the year that the FTE residents train there. For example, if the FTE residents only rotate to this nonhospital site for 3 months of the year, then the percentage of time that the teaching physician(s) spends on nonpatient care direct GME activities at that site equals ($\frac{3}{40} \times 0.25 = 0.019$ or 1.9 percent). Similarly, if FTE residents rotate throughout the year to a nonhospital site that is open 50 hours per week, then the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician(s) in nonpatient care direct GME activities throughout the year is $\frac{3}{50} = 0.06$ or 6 percent. We recognize that the teaching physician(s) may not spend 100 percent of his or her time in that nonhospital site. In fact, many teaching physicians spend some of their week working in a hospital or other facilities. However, we believe that deriving the true amount of time spent by each teaching physician in each nonhospital site in nonpatient care GME direct GME activities would involve the imposition of another form of the documentation burden that the hospital industry and teaching physicians have found onerous up to this point. This methodology eliminates the need for any time studies and it is easy to gather the information needed.

We also acknowledge that the proposal to use the number of hours that a particular nonhospital site is open as a proxy in the denominator for determining the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician(s) in nonpatient care direct GME activities could, in some extreme instances, result in an unusually high percentage of teaching time, which, in turn, would result in a determination of unusually high teaching costs. This is so because, since 3 hours is a constant in the numerator, the fewer the number of hours the clinic is open (the denominator), the greater the calculated percentage of time spent by the teaching physician in nonpatient care direct GME activities. To use an extreme example, if a clinic is only open 10 hours a week, then $\frac{3}{10}$, or 30 percent of the national average salary for the teaching physician's specialty would represent the teaching physician's cost that would be used to determine 90 percent of the costs of the program at the clinic. However, we believe that, for most nonhospital training situations, this revision to use the 3 hour standard and the number of hours the nonhospital

site is open per week is a reasonable alternative to the current procedures for determining the actual teaching physician's cost because these proxies are easily obtainable, discrete numbers that do not necessitate any time studies. Nevertheless, we solicited comments on alternative proxies that might be appropriate to use in the place of the ratio of 3 hours to the number of hours a nonhospital site is open per week. We also note that in the event that this methodology for calculating teaching physician costs in a particular nonhospital site results in an unrealistic amount, we reiterate that a hospital always has the option of determining and paying at least 90 percent of the GME costs using actual physician salary and teaching time information, for all, or some of its training programs occurring in nonhospital settings. In fact, a hospital may choose to use a combination of actual information and proxy information for determining the teaching physician cost. For example, a hospital may choose to use actual physician salary information instead of the national average survey data, but use the 3 hour standard and the number of hours the nonhospital site is open per week to determine the percentage of time spent on teaching activities, or vice versa. Furthermore, we reiterate that under the new definition of ''all or substantially all,'' even if a hospital chooses to document the teaching physician cost using actual teaching physician-specific information, the hospital need only incur 90 percent of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the teaching physicians' salaries attributable to direct GME, and not 100 percent of those costs.

Under our revised policy, 90 percent of the GME costs for a particular program at a particular nonhospital site would be the minimum amount that a hospital must pay to count the FTE resident(s) training at that site for direct GME and IME purposes. If the hospital is already paying the resident's salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and if the costs of the resident's salaries and fringe benefits are equal to at least 90 percent of the total GME costs at the nonhospital site (that is, the 90 percent threshold), then the hospital is paying ''all or substantially all'' of the costs in accordance with our definition, and need not pay an additional amount for teaching physician compensation to count the FTE residents. However, if the hospital is paying less than 90 percent of the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, then the hospital must pay an additional amount toward the teaching physician costs until it is paying at least 90 percent of the GME costs for that program. We believe our revised policy is relatively simple, easy to administer, and eliminates the documentation burdens cited by the industry as being associated with the current policy. However, we note again that even under our revised policy, a hospital is not precluded from choosing to calculate and pay 90 percent of the teaching costs of a program in a nonhospital site in accordance with the existing policy requirements. That is, the hospital may still choose to document the actual teaching physician cost using actual time and salary information from the teaching physician(s) to determine what the true direct GME costs are at that nonhospital site. Once the hospital calculates the actual direct GME costs, it would only be required to pay at least 90 percent of the actual direct GME costs, consistent with our definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting.''

The following is an additional example of the application of the methodology:

Example: For the July 2008 through June 2009 academic year, a hospital with a family practice program sends 3 FTE residents (in different program years) to train at the Family Medicine Center (FMC), a nonhospital site. The hospital's cost reporting period began on January 1, 2008. The FMC is staffed by 5 physicians, all of whom supervise the residents at some point during the year. Four of the physicians are family practitioners, and 1 physician is a psychiatrist. The FMC is open for 50 hours per week. To determine the cost of the teaching physicians, the hospital refers to the most recent national average salary amounts on the national survey published prior to January 1, 2008, which is the 2007 survey. Assume that the national average published salary amount for family practice is $180,000, and the national average published salary amount for psychiatry is $187,000. Since there are multiple physicians in different specialties (absent specific documentation provided by the hospital), the average salary of one FMC physician is calculated as follows: *[($180,000 × 4 family practice physicians) + ($187,000 × 1 psychiatrist)]/5 = $181,400.* Since the residents are on the payroll of the hospital, the hospital knows that the total actual cost of the 3 FTE residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging, if applicable) is $182,000. After applying the 1:1 resident-to-teaching physician limit, there are 3 FTE residents to 3 teaching physicians (again, absent specific documentation provided by the hospital). Thus, the GME cost of the 3 teaching physicians is calculated as follows: *($181,400 × 3) × (3 hours/50 hours) = $32,652.* This teaching physicians' cost of $32,652 is added to the residents' cost of $182,000 to arrive at the total cost of the training program at the nonhospital site of $214,652. To meet the definition of ''all or substantially all,'' the hospital would be required to pay at least 90 percent of the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, which in this example equals $193,187 (that is, 0.90 × $214,652). Since in this case the cost of the 3 FTE residents' salaries and fringe benefits is $182,000, the hospital would not reach the 90 percent cost threshold by simply incurring the costs associated with the residents. The hospital must pay at least an additional $11,187 (that is, $193,187 − $182,000) to meet the 90 percent threshold and satisfy the requirement to pay ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the family practice program at the FMC.

Comment: One commenter, the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), noted that in the proposed rule, we stated that ''the standard of 3 hours of nonpatient care GME activities per week is a reasonable proxy based on data collected from surveys conducted by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), the American Osteopathic Association (AOA), and the Academic Family Medicine Advocacy Alliance (AFMAA), in addition to our own informal surveys of teaching physicians'' (72 FR 4826). The AAMC commented that they would ''like to clarify that the AAMC did not provide CMS with survey data.'' The AAMC indicated that we may have been confused on this issue because the surveys were presented to CMS in a meeting in which representatives of the AAMC were in attendance, and they noted that AAMC staff provided some input to the survey questions. A commenter said that we were correct to describe the surveys as ''informal'' (72 FR 4826), since these surveys were developed and conducted by AOA and AFMAA policy staff who, due to time constraints, did not consult with persons who have expertise in survey development. Another commenter stated that any data collected by CMS informally and used as the basis for a regulation should be available to the public. A commenter referred to the limitations to the data that the AFMAA

noted when it submitted its survey data to CMS, and questioned why CMS would use such ''extremely flawed'' data, when anecdotal evidence suggests that any time greater than one hour per week spent in didactic training is ''way out of line with actual circumstances.'' Commenters enlisted a professor from the Department of Economics at Hunter College in New York, to analyze the survey data and opine as to whether the survey responses provide a valid source for establishing a national proxy. The professor expressed concerns about the data provided to CMS, stated that the data are extremely limited and questionable and should not form the basis of public policy, and suggested that CMS conduct its own rigorous study to identify the best proxy. The professor's analysis also recommended that in the meantime, if CMS wishes to make a decision based on the AOA and AFMAA survey, a proxy that is better supported by the current survey is 2 hours.

Some commenters also asked that CMS consider that the surveys were conducted prior to the issuance of the FY 2007 IPPS final rule in which CMS clarified that time spent in nonpatient care activities in nonhospital sites cannot be counted by a hospital for direct GME and IME purposes. Because of this clarification, hospitals may now be conducting as much of their didactic activities as possible in the hospital complex. Lastly, the commenters noted that to the extent that a resident may spend only a half a day at a nonhospital site per week, ''the idea that [the] 2 or 3 hours of that time is spent in nonpatient care activities defies conventional logic.''

Several commenters suggested that the 3 hour proxy should be reduced to either 1 or 2 hours. One commenter stated that according to the commenter's survey of 54 physicians, the average hours per week spent on nonpatient care direct GME activities was 1.45, with a range of 0 to 6 hours. Another commenter stated that teaching physicians spend 1.2 to 1.5 hours a week in nonpatient care direct GME activities, while one commenter mentioned that for family practice, a teaching expectation of 20 minutes per half day would work best. Several commenters stated that CMS should adjust the proxy according to a resident's program year. For example, one commenter suggested that the number of hours spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities per week should be 1 hour for third year residents, 2 hours for second year residents, and 3 hours for first year residents.

Response: We regret that we inadvertently misattributed the surveys in part to the AAMC. The AAMC is correct that we believed they did have a role in conducting the surveys, but based on their comments, we understand that their role was limited to providing some input into the survey questions. We acknowledged that the surveys conducted by CMS, the AFMAA, and the AOA respectively were informal, and we understood that persons with expertise in survey development were not necessarily consulted due to time constraints. In light of these considerations, we carefully reviewed the analysis of the surveys provided by the professor from Hunter College. We agree that it is inappropriate to apply a proxy of 3 hours to one nonhospital site if the residents only rotate to that nonhospital site for a portion of the week. As we explain further below in response to the comments we received about prorating the teaching physician's cost, in this final rule, we are allowing hospitals to prorate the teaching physician's costs to reflect the FTE time spent by the residents in a program at each nonhospital site. Since we have heard from the teaching hospital industry that it is unlikely that a resident will spend an entire week at the same nonhospital site, in those cases, the hospital would be applying a prorated proxy, which would be less than 3 hours, and may even be less than the 2 hours which the professor from Hunter College indicated could be supported by the survey data. The suggestion from the professor at Hunter College that we conduct a rigorous study is sensible, and we will consider it.

In response to the commenters who request that the 3 hour proxy be adjusted according to a resident's program year, we believe that requiring a hospital to adjust the proxy for each of its residents who are training at a nonhospital site would add unnecessary complexity. Therefore, we are finalizing our policy to use 3 hours in the numerator of the teaching physician cost ratio. We note that if a hospital believes that 3 hours is greater than the actual amount of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities in a particular nonhospital site, the hospital always has the option to work with the teaching physician to provide an actual amount of teaching time for use in calculating the 90 percent cost threshold.

In response to the comment requesting that we consider that the amount of time currently spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities in the nonhospital site could be less than the amount shown in the surveys (since the surveys were conducted prior to the issuance of our clarification regarding didactic activities), we believe this might be true. We acknowledge that the availability of Medicare GME funding is certainly an important factor in a hospital's decision to rotate (or not rotate) residents to nonhospital settings. However, we also recognize there are other significant factors that hospitals must consider in making residency rotation decisions, such as the requirements of accrediting organizations (like the ACGME or the AOA), and local health ''outreach'' initiatives. Thus, we are skeptical that hospitals' longstanding rotational models would shift so dramatically and in such a short period of time due to clarification of the agency's policy regarding the time that residents spend in didactic activities. Further, the commenter is raising a point that can be made about any survey which captures data as of a certain period of time, and cannot necessarily be used to predict future scenarios. However, we may re-evaluate the use of the 3-hour per week standard, possibly in conjunction with a new survey, in the future if appropriate.

Comment: Commenters suggested that since the goal of the proposed rule was to reduce administrative burdens, instead of requiring that hospitals determine the number of hours each nonhospital site is open, we should consider using a national average proxy for total physician work hours per week. A commenter mentioned that there are limited, but still apparently reasonable, data that exist on national average physician work hours. For example, in its 2006 physician workforce report, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) used the American Medical Association's (AMA) Socioeconomic Monitoring System (SMS) from 1998 to estimate work hours by specialty. (The commenter noted that this survey has been discontinued due to response rates that were often too low for individual specialties and practice settings.) The direct patient care hours reported by HRSA ranged from 47 to 58 hours per week. Another study conducted in 2005 by the AAMC's Center for Workforce Studies of physicians over age 50 showed an average of 55 hours worked per week based on over 9,000 respondents, with work hours varying by specialty. For instance, pathologists worked an average of 50 hours weekly on the lower range, while cardiologists worked an average of 63 hours a week. Similarly, data from the Center for Tracking Health System Change reported an average of

53 hours worked per week based on interviews with about 6,600 physicians in all specialties. The commenter asked that we adopt 55 hours as the proxy to use, but suggested that it might be best to use specialty-specific proxies, since there is a range of work hours across specialties. Another commenter suggested that physician work hours as published in JAMA, 2003 be used in the denominator. Alternatively, if we decide to adopt our proposal regarding the clinic hours of operation, then the commenters requested that we confirm that this means the ''posted'' hours, and not the actual hours (for example, the hospital need not account for the closure of the site due to a holiday). Another commenter asked that CMS include a definition of ''hours open'' in the final rule, and specify what documentation would be required.

Other commenters suggested that instead of the clinic hours of operation, the denominator of the ratio used to calculate the teaching physician cost proxy should be the number of hours the teaching physician is working since the physician's salary is relative to the number of hours worked. One commenter requested that we allow adjustments as appropriate when the teaching physician spends only a portion of his or her time at the nonhospital site. Yet another commenter stated that the denominator should be 51 hours, which is derived from the CMS data that is the basis for the RCEs that are currently in use. This commenter noted that if a proxy is being used for both the numerator and denominator, then there is no need to use hours at all. Instead, the formula can be simplified by using a single percentage proxy of the time the physician spends teaching. The commenter thought the formula should be:

Physician compensation proxy using RCEs
× Percentage of business days in year when resident is at site
× Percentage of presumed training time [number of proxy hours/51 hours based on RCEs]
= Physician compensation attributable to training.

Response: We appreciate the commenters' proposals for alternatives to use in the denominator of the ratio that represents the percentage of time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities. The suggestion to use national average proxies for total physician work hours per week is an interesting idea that we will explore more fully and consider for future rulemaking. In particular, we would like to evaluate thoroughly the alternative data sources that are available, and the ramifications of using specialty-specific proxy data. We expect to investigate this issue, and if appropriate, may propose to use specialty-specific data for physician work hours in the future. We are also not adopting the commenter's suggestion to make adjustments to recognize the number of hours the specific teaching physician works each week as the denominator in the ratio. We believe the relevant figure for this purpose is the time the teaching physician spends in the specific nonhospital site, not the time the physician works elsewhere. Furthermore, if we were to allow for adjustments when the teaching physician spends only a portion of his or her time at the nonhospital site as the commenter recommended, the result might be a physician salary percentage that is much higher than the percentage that would result from use of the number of hours the nonhospital site is open in the denominator. For example, if a teaching physician works a total of 60 hours per week, spending 30 hours in the hospital and 30 hours in the nonhospital site, but the nonhospital site is open 40 hours a week, then the teaching physician cost ratio (to be applied to the survey-based physician salary proxy) would be 3/30, or 10 percent under the commenter's suggestion, and 3/40, or 7.5 percent under our proposal. Accordingly, as we stated in the proposed rule, we believe that deriving the true amount of time spent by each teaching physician in each nonhospital site in nonpatient care direct GME activities would involve the imposition of another form of the documentation burden that the hospital industry and teaching physicians have found onerous up to this point. Therefore, we are finalizing our proposal to use the number of hours a nonhospital site is open each week as the denominator in the ratio for calculating the teaching physician cost ratio.

We are also confirming that in determining the number of hours a clinic is open per week, we do not mean the actual hours the nonhospital site is open per week, but instead, we mean ''posted'' or advertised hours. Therefore, the fact that a nonhospital site might be closed several days in a year on legal holidays, for example, would not affect the denominator. That is, if a nonhospital site's posted hours are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. from Monday through Friday, then the denominator would be 40 hours, even if that site was closed for a day(s) for a holiday or some other reason. The hospital may obtain the nonhospital site's posted or advertised hours of operation as documentation to support the number of hours used in the denominator of the teaching time proxy.

Comment: Commenters stated that a reasonable and easy way to administer the supervisory teaching physician cost ratio would be to use 2 hours in the numerator, as supported by the conclusions generated by the professor from Hunter College, and 55 hours in the denominator, which would result in a ''maximum fixed ratio'' of 3.6 percent. Alternatively, if we reject that suggestion, the commenters urged CMS to adopt a ratio ''cap''. The commenters noted that we solicited comments on how to address situations in which that ratio ''could, in some extreme instances, result in a determination of unusually high teaching costs'' in instances where the nonhospital site is open very few hours per week (72 FR 4827). One commenter suggested that this ratio ''cap'' should be 5 percent, and would prevent any extreme or atypical results in determining the portion of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to direct GME. Another commenter recommended that the proxy for determining teaching costs be capped at 3 percent, which would be the result of using 2 hours in the numerator (as suggested by the professor from Hunter College's analysis), and 60 hours in the denominator, since 60 hours is the amount of time a typical teaching physician works (in total, in all settings) per week.

Response: As we explained in response to other comments, we believe it is appropriate at this time to finalize our proposals to use 3 hours in the numerator and the number of hours the nonhospital site is open each week in the denominator. However, the commenter is correct that we solicited comments on how to address situations in which that ratio ''could, in some extreme instances, result in a determination of unusually high teaching costs'' in instances where the nonhospital site is open very few hours per week (72 FR 4827). We believe that in light of these extreme circumstances, the commenters' suggestion to establish a ''cap'' on the ratio is reasonable. We are not adopting the commenters' suggested cap of 3 percent or 5 percent, since both of these caps are based on using 2 hours in the numerator. Since we are finalizing our proposal to use 3 hours in the numerator, we believe an appropriate cap would be 7.5 percent, which would result from using 3 hours in the numerator and 40 hours in the denominator. We believe it is

appropriate to use 40 hours in the denominator because 40 hours is an established, universally recognized, typical work week. However, we may reevaluate this cap in the context of other possible changes we may consider making to the teaching physician cost ratio. Thus, in this final rule, we are instituting a cap of 7.5 percent on the teaching physician cost ratio, such that a hospital need not employ more than 7.5 percent of the teaching physician cost in calculating the amount of payment necessary to meet the 90 percent threshold. However, in adopting this policy, we note that application of the 7.5 percent cap must always be *after* a hospital prorates the teaching physician cost to reflect the amount of FTE time that the residents are in the particular nonhospital site per year. Since half-day rotations appear to be a common model of nonhospital training, which would already reduce the ratio well below 7.5 percent, we anticipate that the cap will only be applicable in the extreme circumstances we mentioned when soliciting comments, and which were of concern to the commenters.

Comment: One commenter referred to a letter received from CMS in which CMS stated that the cost of training a resident in a non-hospital setting is based on the ''percentage of time'' the teaching physician spends in GME activities. Therefore, the commenter asserted, if the hospital is paying for all of the costs of the resident, and the physician can attest that the percentage of time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities is only 10 percent or less (that is, the remainder of the costs of the program), then the test of a hospital incurring ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of training the resident should be met.

Response: CMS's policy for determining the costs of nonpatient care direct GME activities of the teaching physician is, indeed, based on the ''percentage of time'' that the teaching physician spends in such activities. We most recently explained this policy explicitly in the April 2005 Qs&As. In response to Question 5, we stated ''Determination of the teaching physician costs to the nonhospital site is dependent upon the teaching physician's salary and the percentage of time he/she devotes to activities related to non-billable direct GME activities at the nonhospital site.'' [see *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf*] As we have stated in those Qs&As, and in this rule, the statutory test is tied to whether the hospital has paid ''all or substantially all'' of the *costs* of the training program, and not to how much time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities, although that time percentage is certainly necessary for determining the amount of the *cost* that the hospital must pay. Accordingly, the revised policy is consistent with the previous policy in that the hospital must establish the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician in nonpatient care direct GME activities in order to determine the cost of the teaching physician's GME time. However, the revised policy allows for the use of proxies in order to make those calculations. That is, the ratio of 3 hours of nonpatient care direct GME time per week to the number of hours that the nonhospital site is open also represents the percentage of time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities, and when applied to the physician's salary (as established using survey data), will result in a proxy for the teaching physician cost. As mentioned in the preceding summary of comments, commenters requested that CMS place a cap on the percentage of the teaching physician's time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities, as determined using the ratio. As explained above, in this final rule, we are instituting a cap of 7.5 percent on this teaching physician cost ratio, which is less than the 10 percent to which this commenter requested that physicians be allowed to attest. Furthermore, we do not believe it is appropriate to say that a hospital has met the test of incurring ''all or substantially all'' of the costs based simply on a physician's attestation that 10 percent or less of his or her time is spent on nonpatient care direct GME activities. Again, it is the cost that is important, not the amount of the teaching physicians' time.

Comment: We received several comments relating to the method for computing the teaching physician cost in instances where the residents rotate to multiple nonhospital sites for varying periods of time, and whether prorating is applicable. The commenters explained that typically, nonhospital rotations consist of partial day rotations, which can be either partial days or partial weeks, to 3 or 4 different nonhospital sites per week. The commenters mentioned that continuity clinics, which are required for internal medicine residents, are generally rotations of one half-day per week to a specific nonhospital site over the 3-year internal medicine program. The residents may also rotate to other nonhospital sites during each week. The commenters asserted that if hospitals were to assume 3 hours of supervisory teaching physician time for each clinic during a week, the estimate of teaching physician costs would be ''severely inflated,'' and the hospital would be ''paying several times over for training costs incurred during the same time period.''

One commenter noted that we mention the issue of prorating in instances where the residents are not rotating to the nonhospital site for a whole year. Specifically, the preamble states, ''If FTE residents are not rotating to a particular nonhospital site throughout a whole year, then the national average salary of the teaching physician would be prorated accordingly. The cost of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) would already be reflective of an FTE count (72 FR 4822).'' In addition, the preamble stated in the context of the teaching physician cost ratio, ''For example, if FTE residents rotate throughout the year to a nonhospital site that is open 40 hours per week, then the percentage of time spent by the teaching physician(s) in nonpatient care direct GME activities throughout the year at that site is $\frac{3}{40} = 0.075$ or 7.5 percent. If FTE residents rotate to that nonhospital site for only a portion of a year, then the ratio of $\frac{3}{40}$ would be further multiplied by the percentage of the year that the FTE residents train there. For example, if the FTE residents only rotate to this nonhospital site for 3 months of the year, then the percentage of time that the teaching physician(s) spends on nonpatient care direct GME activities at that site equals ($\frac{3}{40} \times 0.25 = 0.019$ or 1.9 percent)'' (72 FR 4827). The commenter continued that although the concept of prorating is supported by the preamble, in discussions with CMS staff, it seems that we intended to allow prorating ''selectively.'' The commenter stated that their understanding of our position is that if a resident rotates to a nonhospital site for several days each week over a period of time, the resident's salary and fringe benefits would be prorated, but not the physician's salary. The physician's salary would only be prorated if the rotation occurred in a block situation, such as 3 months (in the proposed rule example mentioned above).

The commenter included an addendum which contained examples to illustrate what they believe to be the ''flaws'' in our position. In the first example, a resident rotates to a nonhospital site for 6 consecutive months, and then spends the rest of the year in a hospital. In the second example, the resident spends 2.5 days a

week at a nonhospital site throughout the entire year (an aggregate time of 6 months), with the remaining time in a hospital setting. In the first example, the commenter understands that we would prorate by 0.5 the resident's stipends and benefits, as well as the physician's salary. In the second example, the commenter understands that we would only prorate the resident's stipends and fringe benefits. The commenter stated that the result is that even though ''in the aggregate'' the resident spends the same amount of time in the nonhospital site, if he or she rotates in increments of less than a week, the hospital will incur more in supervisory costs. Another commenter believed that there is no basis for distinguishing between these ''half-time'' rotations, and teaching hospitals should not have to incur any additional costs if the sum of the assignments for the resident on an FTE basis is the same in either case. The former commenter concluded that as long as both the resident and physician salaries are prorated to match the length of time of the rotation, the supervisory cost amount will not be overstated. Alternatively, the commenter noted that the three hour presumption could be prorated, rather than the physician salary, as the result would be the same either way.

Response: In responding to these comments on the issue of prorating, it is important to first understand the context in which we made the decision to propose that 3 hours be used as the proxy for the amount of time a teaching physician spends per week in nonpatient care direct GME activities. As we explained in the proposed rule, we derived the 3 hour figure from informal surveys conducted by the AFMAA and the AOA, which essentially showed ranges of 0 hours to 4.7 hours for the time that physicians spend on nonpatient care direct GME activities (72 FR 4826). Although we acknowledge that the surveys were not rigorous, we believed (and still believe) the survey data warrant the use of 3 hours, and not a lower number, as a proxy in determining the costs hospitals must pay in accordance with the statute. This is especially so since, as explained above, the 3 hour figure is subject to prorating based upon the proportion of time residents are present in the nonhospital site. If ''half day'' rotations to nonhospital sites are a very common training model as the commenters suggest, then it is reasonable to conclude that the amount of nonpatient care direct GME hours reported in the survey results *reflects* this common mode of training. Given that our motivation was to remove the burden on teaching physicians in documenting their teaching time, we do not believe it was unreasonable for us to propose that 3 hours be used as a ''one size fits all'' proxy. Given further that, as mentioned above and explained below, our final policy will permit the 3 hour figure to vary when residents are not rotating to the nonhospital site during the entire year, we believe this policy allows sufficient flexibility to recognize the circumstances under which most residency training occurs in nonhospital settings. And finally, we recognize that proxies, by definition, are not perfect. Therefore, we note again that hospitals always have the option of working with the nonhospital site teaching physician(s) to obtain actual data specific to the number of hours the teaching physician spends per week on nonpatient care direct GME activities in calculating the 90 percent threshold (72 FR 4826).

However, we do believe that the commenters raise a legitimate concern in that if the 3 hour proxy were to be applied to each nonhospital site, then, in cases where the residents rotate to multiple nonhospital sites each week, the percentage of teaching physician costs for each site would be considerably overstated. We agree with the commenters that if both the resident and physician costs are prorated to match the length of time of the rotation, the teaching physician cost amount will not be overstated. We are also convinced by the commenters that, for the amount of teaching physician costs, there should be no distinction between part-time rotations that occur in consecutive blocks as compared to part-time rotations that are not consecutive over the course of a training year, but equate to the same amount of time on an FTE basis. That is, we agree that just as the residents' salary and fringe benefit portion is prorated to reflect the actual FTE time spent in a particular nonhospital site, the teaching physician cost should also be prorated to reflect that FTE time (that is, either the physician's salary would be prorated, or the 3 hours would be prorated by the FTE percentage; the result would be the same either way). Accordingly, we are modifying our proposal to allow for prorating in this final rule. Thus, in the example on page 4827 of the proposed rule quoted by the commenter above, where the FTE residents only rotate to the nonhospital site for 3 months of the year, the percentage of time that the teaching physician(s) spends on nonpatient care direct GME activities at that site would be multiplied by 0.25, regardless of whether the rotation occurs in a 3-month consecutive block, or in increments that equate to 3 months (or 0.25 FTE) over the course of the entire training year.

Comment: Many commenters recommended that we allow physicians at nonhospital sites to sign attestation forms estimating the average time they spend supervising residents per week. Another commenter said that since the primary reason for residents to rotate into nonhospital sites is to perform patient care activities (as opposed to nonpatient care or didactic activities), the amount of time that a supervising physician spends teaching residents is ''typically very low.'' Therefore, CMS should accept attestations stating that the only teaching time ''in a resident's entire nonhospital rotation was for the resident evaluation and that it took a half hour or less.'' One commenter asserted that ''it's a waste of money'' to have physicians attest to the amount of money they earn, and that if CMS is going to make payment mandatory, then a minimum of $60 per hour should be established. Several commenters asked that we specify the type of actual documentation that is acceptable in the case where a hospital chooses not to use the proxies we specify in this final rule. (That is, the commenters requested that we specify how they might use local surveys and sampling techniques to obtain actual data to calculate nonhospital teaching physician costs, rather than comprehensive time and motion studies). Another commenter asked whether the teaching physician must keep continuous time records or whether the hospital can use time studies. This commenter further stated that if time studies are to be used, we should indicate that they are to ''* * * be kept in accordance with CMS Pub. 15–1, Section 2313.2.''

Response: In the cases where a hospital wishes to use the actual amount of time a particular teaching physician is spending in nonpatient care direct GME activities with or on behalf of the residents, we do not believe that attestations from the teaching physician without any supporting documentation is acceptable. Furthermore, if a hospital chooses not to use the proxies specified in this final rule, then we believe the hospital should use actual data specific to the teaching physician in the particular nonhospital site, and not an arbitrary amount such as $60 or information from local surveys or broader samples. However, it would be acceptable for the physician to provide to the hospital a signed document specifying, based on actual records kept, the amount of such

time spent with the residents, whether this amount is greater than 3 hours, or, as one commenter indicated, a half hour or less. Similar to the documentation that was historically required of hospitals to allocate teaching physician costs between Part A and Part B and between operating costs and direct medical education costs, if the physician is supervising residents in the nonhospital site throughout the academic year, the physician may complete a 2-week time study at two different points during the academic year (that is, two separate 2-week time studies). If a physician only supervises residents in the nonhospital site for the equivalent of a month or less in an academic year, then the physician may complete a 1 week time study. The percentage of time a teaching physician spends with or on behalf of the residents in nonpatient care direct GME activities over the course of the time study may then be extrapolated to apply to the rest of the academic year. Accordingly, we are not requiring that time studies completed by teaching physicians in nonhospital sites for the purpose of determining the 90 percent cost threshold meet the requirements in CMS Pub. 15–1, Section 2313.2. For example, under CMS Pub. 15–1, Section 2313.2.E.2, a minimally-acceptable time study must encompass at least 1 full week per month of the cost reporting period, whereas for purposes of determining the percentage of time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities in the nonhospital site, the teaching physician may complete two separate 2-week time studies (or a 1 week time study if the teaching physician supervises residents for the equivalent of a month or less during the academic year). Since the teaching physician may not know the percentage of time spent on nonpatient care direct GME activities at the time the written agreement between the hospital and the nonhospital site is being entered into (since the written agreement must be in place before the rotation begins), the written agreement can be made based upon either the 3-hour per week proxy or an estimated percentage (based on the prior year's rotations, if applicable), and the percentage may be modified during the academic year if necessary. Further, the teaching physician (or the nonhospital site employer) and the hospital should modify the calculation of the 90 percent cost threshold and the written agreement in order to reflect the actual percentage by June 30 of that academic year. The source documentation used to determine the amount of teaching physician compensation should be made available to the Medicare contractor upon request during audit.

Comment: One commenter asked CMS to ''* * * expressly clarify in either the text of the regulation or in the preamble to the final rule that the alternative proxies will not be used by CMS or fiscal intermediaries as a way to disallow a hospital's computation and payment using actual teaching time and teaching costs.'' The commenter expressed concern ''* * * that the alternative proxies * * * will be used against hospitals as some sort of floor in analyzing the reasonableness of actual costs for those hospitals that choose not to use these alternative proxies.'' The commenter believes that our proxies would be viewed as a floor or a cap when taking into consideration actual data. The commenter believes we should affirm that the proxies are an option we have made available to providers because of the difficulty of documenting actual teaching costs at the nonhospital site. Another commenter urged CMS ''* * * to make a clear statement to this effect, that is, that the intent of the parties is the controlling factor, and that neither CMS nor its contractors will substitute their judgment for [that] of the parties directing the training program.'' The commenter noted that in the cases where there is a cost, the commenter supports the use of a formula to calculate faculty costs.

Response: We do not intend to use the proxies specified in this final rule to establish a ''floor'' or ''cap.'' Rather, they represent an option that hospitals may choose to use in making the calculations to ensure they are incurring ''all or substantially all'' of the training costs at the nonhospital site if it is too burdensome for them to collect actual data. Furthermore, we would like to emphasize that when there is a cost associated with the residency training program at the nonhospital site, regardless of the ''intent of the parties,'' the hospital must either pay the actual cost or the cost as determined using the proxies.

C. Other Issues To Be Considered

Although we are revising the standard used for a hospital to incur ''all or substantially of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' such that the hospital is permitted to count FTE residents training in nonhospital sites, the other existing regulations regarding nonhospital sites would still generally apply, but would require some modification. Under the existing regulations at § 413.78(e), a hospital is permitted to count residents training in nonhospital sites only if the residents spend their time in patient care activities, and the hospital must comply with either of the following: (a) It must pay all or substantially all of the costs of the training program in the nonhospital site by the end of the third month following the month in which the training in the nonhospital site occurred; or (b) it must have a written agreement with the nonhospital site that states that the hospital will incur the cost of the resident's salary and fringe benefits while the resident is training in the nonhospital site and the hospital is providing reasonable compensation to the nonhospital site for supervisory teaching activities. The written agreement must indicate the compensation the hospital is providing to the nonhospital site for supervisory teaching activities. We proposed to add a new § 413.78(f) for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, to reflect the revised definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting.'' First, if a hospital chooses to make concurrent payments; that is, pay the training costs by the end of the third month following the month in which the training occurred, then the hospital must be able to document for audit purposes that the concurrent payments it makes reflect ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, in accordance with the new definition at § 413.75(b).

Alternatively, if the hospital chooses to maintain a written agreement with the nonhospital site (which, we note, must be in place before the residents begin training at a nonhospital site), the new § 413.78(f) would state that the written agreement must indicate that the hospital will incur at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the resident's salary and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) while the resident is training in the nonhospital site and the portion of the cost of the teaching physician's salary attributable to direct GME. The written agreement should specify the total compensation amount the hospital will incur to meet the 90 percent ''all or substantially all'' threshold, and whether this amount reflects only residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), or reflects an amount for teaching physician compensation as well. We believe the written agreement should specify the total amount of nonhospital site training costs the hospital will incur and specify what costs are included in that amount because the hospital would need to determine up front the amount it must

pay to meet the 90 percent threshold and incur ''all or substantially all'' of the cost in accordance with our definition. In addition, the provision of this information in the written agreement will simplify the audit process when the Medicare contractor determines whether the amount paid by the hospital to the nonhospital site reflects ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the program in the nonhospital site in accordance with the new definition at § 413.75(b). We note that regardless of whether a hospital chooses to make concurrent payments to the nonhospital site, or to have a written agreement, the hospital must demonstrate that it is paying for at least 90 percent of the costs of each program at each nonhospital site according to the following formula (although actual data may be used in place of the proxies):

0.90 × [(sum of each FTE resident's salary + fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable)) plus the portion of the teaching physician's compensation attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities].

The portion of the teaching physician's compensation attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities may be calculated as follows: *(3/number of hours nonhospital site is open per week) × (national average salary for each teaching physician).*

If there are no teaching costs (because, for example, the residents are rotating to a nonhospital site where the teaching physician is a solo practitioner), then the written agreement should indicate that the specified compensation amount reflects only residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) because there are no teaching physician costs (since the teaching physician is a solo practitioner). Finally, we note that, as under existing regulations, if the hospital does choose to have a written agreement with the nonhospital site, the hospital must, at a minimum, liquidate the costs identified in the written agreement in accordance with the regulations at § 413.100(c)(2)(i).

In addition, we note that under current policy, a hospital may choose to provide non-monetary, in-kind compensation rather than provide direct financial compensation to the nonhospital site for supervisory teaching activities. Under the new definition of ''all or substantially all,'' a hospital would still be permitted to provide in-kind compensation to the nonhospital site, but, as under current policy, the hospital must be able to document that the value of the in-kind compensation is at least equivalent monetarily to the portion of the actual or proxy-based costs for that teaching physician attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities. That is, the hospital must show that the value of in-kind compensation is sufficient to meet the 90 percent threshold using the formula stated above in this section.

We also believe it is important to review how the written agreement requirements apply when a hospital's residents rotate to nonhospital sites such as clinics owned by a medical school. As we stated in response to Question 9 on the Qs&As on our Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf*, ''rather than having a written agreement with each clinic, it would be appropriate for the hospital to have a written agreement with the medical school, since the medical school owns the clinics. If the residents are training in various medical school clinics, *the hospital must have written agreement(s) reflecting the compensation arrangements for each clinic*'' (emphasis added). Unfortunately, we have learned of numerous situations where a hospital has a single agreement with the medical school in which the hospital specifies a lump sum dollar amount that it is paying the medical school for GME-related services that the medical school is providing, but there is no breakout at all as to the specific training costs attributable to individual clinics, or to the specific programs at those clinics. Without a breakout of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities at each nonhospital site, the Medicare contractor is unable to determine whether the hospital has properly paid the costs of each specialty training program at each nonhospital site in accordance with the statutory and regulatory requirements. Likewise, under the new definition of ''all or substantially all,'' whether hospitals pay for the costs of a program at a nonhospital site on a concurrent basis, or if they have a written agreement, they must be able to document how they are paying for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of a particular program at each nonhospital site. Global agreements with lump sum payment amounts, either for teaching physician costs or for nonhospital training in general, have not been sufficient under existing policy and would not be sufficient under the finalized policy. Similarly, as under current policy, if two (or more) hospitals train residents in the same accredited program, and the residents rotate to the same nonhospital site(s), the hospitals cannot share the costs of that program at that nonhospital site (for example, by dividing the FTE residents they wish to count according to some predetermined methodology), as we do not believe this is consistent with the statutory requirement at section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act which states that the hospital incur ''*all, or substantially all, of the costs for the training program in that setting*'' (emphasis added). Finally, as under current policy, we note that in the instance where a hospital is sending residents in several different specialty programs to train in the same nonhospital site, and it wishes to count all of those FTE residents for purposes of IME and direct GME payment, the hospital must be able to document that it is separately meeting the ''all or substantially all'' threshold for each specialty program at that site. (That is, the hospital would determine the 90 percent threshold in accordance with the methodology described above separately for the teaching physicians and residents involved in each specialty program, and would apply the resident-to-teaching physician ratio limit if applicable).

Comment: We received several comments on our existing policy as reiterated in the proposed rule for ''global'' written agreements, which are common with academic medical centers. According to the commenters, global agreements are designed to provide an administratively simple mechanism for teaching hospitals to compensate the medical school for a variety of reasons, one of which may be for supervisory physician costs—both in the hospital and in clinics owned by the medical school, and for other purposes which may not be specified in detail. The commenters believe that to the extent that nonhospital supervisory costs are included in the global agreement, a straightforward mechanism for documenting the costs should be devised, so as not to complicate the process of entering into the agreements, which are entered into only once a year. One commenter noted that we stated in the proposed rule that ''global agreements with lump sum payment amounts, either for teaching physician costs or for nonhospital training in general, have not been sufficient under existing policy and would not be sufficient under the proposed policy'' (72 FR page 4829). The commenter argued that if our stated purpose in issuing the proposed rule was to simplify and relieve administrative burdens, then the proposed rule has not

achieved its goal ''at all in a large number of instances.'' A commenter requested that we should issue an interim final rule with comment period to solicit additional comments to ensure that global agreements between teaching hospitals and medical schools can be used to simplify the administrative complexity of this regulation while addressing the intent of the statute as CMS sees it. One commenter suggested that, at a minimum, hospitals should be allowed to make their ''best estimate'' of the number and length of each rotation and modify them throughout the year as necessary. In addition, the commenter stated that we should allow hospitals to use historical nonhospital site rotation experiences to determine an aggregate nonhospital supervisory amount that could be referenced in the global agreement for the upcoming year. Another commenter asked that CMS suggest a standard written agreement template for hospitals to use.

Response: In the preamble to the proposed rule, we mentioned several existing issues that we believed were important to reiterate and to discuss in the context of our new proposals. One such issue was ''global agreements.'' We believed it was necessary to remind the public about the concerns we had with global agreements, precisely because we understand that they are quite common among teaching hospitals and related medical schools, but if lacking relevant details, are not sufficient in a statutory and regulatory framework that requires a hospital to ''incur all, or substantially all, of the costs for the training program in that setting'' (that is, for each program at each nonhospital site as specified in section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act). In the proposed rule, we explained that global agreements often do not break out the specific training costs attributable to individual clinics, or to the specific programs at those clinics. ''Without a breakout of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities at each nonhospital site, the Medicare contractor is unable to determine whether the hospital has properly paid the costs of each specialty program at each nonhospital site in accordance with the statutory and regulatory requirements. Likewise, under the new proposed definition of ''all or substantially all,'' whether hospitals pay for the costs of a program at a nonhospital site on a concurrent basis, or if they have a written agreement, they must be able to document how they are paying for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of a particular program at each nonhospital site. Global agreements with lump sum payment amounts, either for teaching physician costs or for nonhospital training in general, have not been sufficient under existing policy and would not be sufficient under the proposed policy'' (72 FR 4829). Accordingly, while it was our intent in the proposed rule, and in this final rule, to minimize hospitals' documentation burdens for resident training in nonhospital sites, the issues to which we were particularly sympathetic were those beyond the control of a hospital, such as a teaching physician who refuses to disclose salary information. Further, our proposals were intended to encourage *more* transparency in those arrangements that are pertinent to Medicare payments, so as to eliminate the ''deadlock'' that hospitals and Medicare contractors have experienced, and to provide for an audit and reimbursement process that is as smooth and as ''painless'' as possible. As indicated by the commenters, these global agreements are entered into to cover a variety of funding issues, and are not entered into solely (if at all) for the purpose of meeting Medicare regulations. Thus, these agreements often do not provide the level of detail that is sufficient to comply with the Medicare regulations. Since 1987, when hospitals were first allowed to count the time that residents spent training in nonhospital sites for direct GME purposes, we instituted the written agreement requirement precisely to provide an administrative tool for use by the Medicare contractors to assist in determining whether hospitals incurred the necessary training costs in accordance with the statute and regulations. Similarly, that is why we stated in the answer to Question 9 in the 2005 Qs&As on the CMS Web site at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf* that, while it is permissible for a hospital to have an agreement with a medical school on behalf of the clinics owned by the medical school, in such a case the hospital also must ''have written agreement(s) reflecting the compensation arrangements *for each clinic*'' (emphasis added). Thus, while we certainly would like to simplify matters, we also want to ensure that hospitals receiving payment relating to training occurring in nonhospital settings are properly incurring the training program costs in accordance with the statute. If hospitals wish to count residents training in nonhospital sites for direct GME and IME purposes, they must be able to document that they are paying for ''all, or substantially all'' of the training costs for each program *at each site*. We believe that a written agreement reflecting the amounts being paid by the hospital for each site is a reasonable requirement for in such documentation. Alternatively, we note that under § 413.78(e) and new § 413.78(f), hospitals are not required to have written agreements with nonhospital sites but instead may opt to pay for the nonhospital training program costs on a concurrent basis, although the hospital certainly must still be able to document that the concurrent payments reflect ''all or substantially all'' of the cost, in accordance with the current and new definition at § 413.75(b). However, given that a hospital's residents may train at hundreds of nonhospital sites, we do understand that it may be difficult for hospitals to finalize the details of all of their written agreements by the start of an academic year. Accordingly, in response to the commenters' suggestions, we are modifying our policy with respect to written agreements (for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007). Current policy requires that the written agreement be in place prior to the time that the residents begin training in the nonhospital site (that is, signed by both the hospital and the nonhospital site). Since residents rotate to various nonhospital sites at different points in the residency year, a written agreement may or may not have to be in place with a particular nonhospital site by July 1. Rather, the agreement should be in place by the day before the rotation is scheduled to begin. For example, if a resident is scheduled to rotate to Clinic A on July 1, then the written agreement between the hospital and Clinic A must be in place by June 30 (that is, the day before July 1, not the end of the following residency year). However, if residents first rotate to Clinic B on December 1, then the written agreement between the hospital and Clinic B would have to be in place by November 30. In response to the commenters' suggestions, we are changing our policy to allow hospitals to modify the 90 percent threshold calculations in their written agreements by the end of the academic year (that is, June 30) to reflect that the hospital is meeting the requirement to incur at least 90 percent of the costs associated with the actual training program rotations. This policy would work in a fashion similar to our current policy on Medicare GME affiliation agreements, but with some

differences. Under § 413.79(f), Medicare GME affiliation agreements must be entered into (and received by the Medicare contractor and CMS) by July 1 of the applicable residency program year, but hospitals may modify these agreements by June 30 of that residency year to reflect changes in the rotations that may not have been anticipated. With respect to nonhospital training, the hospital would have the option of using either the proxies for teaching physician costs as finalized in this final rule, or actual data for the physician salary and teaching time spent in nonpatient care direct GME activities. If the hospital opts to use actual data and not the proxies, the hospital may use the prior year's cost amounts as a placeholder upon entering into the written agreement, and must modify the agreements by June 30 of that residency year to properly reflect the actual costs that the hospital must incur in accordance with the 90 percent threshold for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the training program in the nonhospital setting. In addition, in the event that hospitals send residents to unanticipated or originally unscheduled rotations in nonhospital sites, the hospitals may make their ''best estimate'' by the day before the rotations occur (the hospital may use the prior year's rotation experiences as a model), and must make modifications by the end of the academic year to ensure that they have properly met the 90 percent threshold. We are modifying the proposed regulations text at § 413.78(f)(3)(ii) to reflect this new policy change with respect to modification of the written agreements by June 30 of the applicable academic year.

With respect to the comment requesting that we create a standard template for written agreements, we do not believe a template would necessarily be helpful, considering that, even within one hospital, the rotations can differ significantly across specialties. The formula for determining the 90 percent threshold, which is the crux of the written agreement, is clearly written in this final rule, and should be followed for all programs.

Comment: One comment centered on the various arrangements teaching hospitals have with affiliated medical schools for training residents both inside and outside the hospital. The teaching physicians, as medical school employees, are compensated in a ''variety of manners'' for various types of services, including patient care, administrative duties, research, etc. The commenter asked that in the case where the hospital is paying the medical school an amount that the medical school determined ''in good faith'' to be the compensation for ''teaching services'' both in the hospital and in nonhospital sites, CMS should consider that the hospital has ''borne the full costs of teaching services in nonhospital sites * * * even where there is no allocation of those amounts between'' the training in the hospital and the training in the nonhospital sites.

Response: Although the commenter does not specifically use the term ''global agreement'' in his comment, it appears that the scenario being described has many of the same features as a global agreement. That is, the hospital pays the medical school a lump sum for ''teaching services,'' often occurring in the hospital and various nonhospital sites, but there is no allocation as to the teaching costs particular to each program at each nonhospital site. In the proposed rule, and in response to a comment above, we explained that global agreements do not break out the specific training costs attributable to individual clinics, or to the specific programs at those clinics. Without a breakout of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities at each nonhospital site, the Medicare contractor is unable to determine whether the hospital has actually paid the costs of each specialty program at each nonhospital site, in accordance with the statutory and regulatory requirements. This scenario differs from one described in Question 7 in the April 2005 Qs&As [see *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/AcuteInpatientPPS/Downloads/nonhospQA.pdf*]. In that instance, the teaching physician receives a salary directly from the hospital for teaching services inside the hospital and in nonhospital sites, rather than the medical school, and when the physician is supervising the residents in nonhospital sites, he/she is not receiving any other type of salary payment from the nonhospital sites. Thus, to the extent that there are teaching costs in those nonhospital sites, the hospital is already paying for those costs. The situation described in the Qs&As is different from the situation outlined by the commenter, in which the teaching physician receives a salary from the medical school covering a variety of activities, and, without a determination as to the costs of each training program in each nonhospital site, the Medicare contractor cannot determine if the hospital properly paid ''all or substantially all'' of the costs.

Comment: One commenter found our proposal to require hospitals to specify the total amount the hospital will incur, and to specify what costs are included in that amount, as ''quite surprising.'' The commenter believes that this requirement will complicate the preparation of the written agreements, and that it is not necessary to specify the cost amount which will be used to determine if the hospital meets a certain threshold for reimbursement within a contract between two parties. The commenter recognized the need for this information to be available upon audit, but strongly encouraged CMS not to require that the cost information be included in the written agreements. Other commenters also recommended that the regulation not require that the details of the computation be included in the written agreement, because the scheduled issuance of the final rule is so close to the beginning of the upcoming academic year (July 1, 2007), and also because the actual costs a hospital will incur cannot be accurately determined until after the fact. For example, the residents' travel and lodging costs may be higher or lower than the amount initially estimated when the written agreement was made. Commenters questioned whether our proposal to use proxies to reflect the time the time the teaching physician spends in nonpatient care direct GME activities will actually reduce the documentation burden on hospitals since hospitals would be required to collect information on, in some cases, hundreds of clinics. One commenter noted that the paperwork burden required by the proposed rule is ''still massive,'' and disproportionately disadvantages family medicine programs and perhaps other primary care programs, threatening rural access to care. One commenter stated that hospitals which meet the 90 percent threshold by incurring the resident salaries and fringe benefits should not be required to state in the written agreements that ''* * * the hospital will pay all or substantially all of the cost for resident rotations to the nonhospital site'' or ''* * * that the hospital will incur at least 90 percent of the cost of the resident's salary and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable) while the resident is training in the non hospital site.'' The commenter provided examples of how the regulation text should be changed to conform to the commenter's suggestion and further stated that hospitals which meet the 90 percent threshold by

incurring the resident salaries and fringe benefits should not be required to identify the compensation paid to residents for their salary and fringe benefits. Another commenter stated that documentation burdens associated with written agreements can be eliminated if CMS would permit a one time agreement with a ''major affiliated partner,'' and allow for multi-year agreements. Finally, one commenter argued that in light of the limited time that hospitals would have to enter into written agreements with all of their nonhospital sites in accordance with the policies set forth in the final rule by July 1, CMS should impose a one year transition or grace period in which a written agreement can be amended or newly executed at any time prior to June 30, 2008, and still be effective for the applicable portions of the academic year starting on July 1, 2007. If CMS does not agree with this request, then the commenter suggested that alternatively, CMS should allow a 180 day grace period through December 31, 2007. Under either scenario, the commenter stated that the grace period would not ''impact in any way the requirement that hospitals actually incur 90 percent of the training costs,'' and would ''still afford intermediaries with fully executed written agreements for use during their audits.'' If CMS does not grant the commenter's request for a grace period, then the commenter asked that CMS relax the requirement to specify the precise teaching compensation amount in the written agreements for at least the next academic year. The commenter also requested that in general, CMS should allow the written agreements to be executed during or shortly after rotations or to allow the written agreements to be more general about the amounts to be paid. CMS should also indicate that the ultimate amounts paid can vary from the amounts set forth in the written agreements. Finally, CMS should provide a clarification or preferably a detailed example demonstrating how to apply the various proxies when a hospital sends residents in two or more specialty programs to the same nonhospital site. The commenter was unclear how separate computations should be made when different specialty programs operate at the nonhospital site for a different number of hours per week (for example, internal medicine for 15 hours per week and family practice for 25 hours per week, while the nonhospital site is open for 40 hours a week).

Response: We do not believe the specification of the actual amounts the hospital is to pay the nonhospital site will complicate the process of the written agreements. The details of the 90 percent cost threshold are the essence of the written agreement, and it is appropriate that they be included at the time the written agreement is being entered into. Considering that we are already allowing hospitals to use easily accessible proxy data, we do not believe it would be appropriate to allow for additional ''short cuts'' and imprecision in the development of the written agreements. Additionally, we do not believe it is advisable to encourage hospitals to delay the process of making the cost calculations necessary to establish that a hospital meets the 90 percent threshold. Allowing hospitals to delay the process of ironing out the details of the costs the hospital needs to incur in order to meet the ''all or substantially all'' requirements could possibly lead to unforeseen disallowances 2 or more years after the fact when the applicable cost report is being audited. We believe it is better that hospitals take the time to compute the correct payment amounts at the beginning of (or modified during, as applicable) the academic year, rather than scramble to provide the details during an audit. (Similarly, hospitals that do not employ written agreements but instead are paying for training program costs on a concurrent basis also need to determine up front what they are paying to each nonhospital site to ensure that they pay the proper amount every three months). However, we are sympathetic to the comment regarding the limited time in which hospitals have to enter into or modify existing contracts in accordance with the policy set forth in this final rule. While we do not believe a transition or grace period is necessary, in this final rule, as we stated in response to a comment above, we are modifying our policy to allow modifications of written agreements. Should hospitals, urban or rural, find it difficult to calculate the exact amounts to be paid under the 90 percent cost threshold at the time they are entering into the agreements, our decision to allow modifications to the determination of the 90 percent threshold by June 30 of the applicable academic year should provide some relief. Additionally, we continue to believe it is important for the written agreements to specify the compensation amounts provided for resident salaries and fringe benefits because doing so will be useful for hospitals in that they will have greater assurance that they are meeting requirements to count FTE residents training in nonhospital settings and for Medicare contractors in that they will have available more of the information needed for the audit process. Even in the instance where the hospital is paying at least 90 percent of the total cost just by paying the residents' salaries and fringe benefits, the Medicare contractor would still need to know what the total costs are in order to verify that the residents' portion is, in fact, 90 percent of the total costs. Thus, we are also specifying in the regulations text of this final rule that the written agreement should include the amount that represents the total cost of the nonhospital site, in addition to including the amount that represents 90 percent of the costs.

In instances where residents in more than one specialty program are rotating to the same nonhospital site, the 90 percent threshold must be determined separately for each program. In the example mentioned by the commenter, where a nonhospital site is used for internal medicine for 15 hours per week and for family practice for 25 hours per week, and the nonhospital site is open for 40 hours a week, the teaching time ratio for internal medicine and family practice respectively would be 3/40. In the preamble above (and on page 4825 of the proposed rule), we included an example of how the 1:1 resident to teaching physician ratio would be applied in the instance where a nonhospital site is staffed by physicians in different specialties. We stated that unless the hospital can document that only certain physicians were involved in supervising the residents, we would apply the 1:1 ratio to *all* of the physicians in the nonhospital site. Then, an average national salary of the mix of physician specialties in the practice would be computed, and would be multiplied by 3/40 for use in the 90 percent threshold for internal medicine and family practice respectively.

Lastly, we are requiring that hospitals have written agreements in place with nonhospital sites regardless of the nonhospital site's relationship to the hospital, and we do not believe an exception is warranted for a ''major affiliated partner.'' While we do not believe there is anything wrong per se with one time or multi-year agreements with nonhospital sites with which a hospital has a long-standing rotational relationship, we question whether such agreements would properly reflect the true costs in the 90 percent threshold that must be incurred from year to year, since, as so many commenters have pointed out, rotations to nonhospital sites can be so dynamic.

Comment: Several commenters asserted that there is no legal

requirement that an agreement must be signed before nonhospital training under an agreement begins. The commenters stated that if the presence of an agreement can be established after the fact by concurrent payments, CMS should not deny payment as long as there is an agreement that is ratified by the signature of all parties at any time during the agreement. At a minimum, CMS should recognize the presence of a binding agreement as of the time that all parties execute the agreement.

Response: With respect to GME policy concerning written agreements relating to residency training in nonhospital sites, our policy has always been that the written agreement must be in place prior to the time the residents begin training at the nonhospital site. A written agreement signed before the time the residents begin training at the nonhospital site, stating that the hospital will incur the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, indicates the hospital's ongoing commitment to incur those costs. Written agreements that are retroactive to the time the residents began training at the nonhospital site do not demonstrate that there was an ongoing commitment by the hospital to incur the costs. In fact, we are taking this opportunity to clarify the regulations text at § 413.78(f)(3)(ii) to specify that the written agreement must be in place between the hospital and the nonhospital site before the training begins in that nonhospital site. The commenters suggest that if the presence of an agreement can be established after the fact by concurrent payments, CMS should not deny payment when an agreement is not in place at the outset of the training but is later ratified by the signature of all parties at any time. However, we note that if the hospital can show that it made payments representing all or substantially all of the costs of the training program in the nonhospital setting on a concurrent basis, then under the regulations at section 413.78(e) or (f), a written agreement is not needed. This is because these regulations require either a written agreement or concurrent payments. However, if, for whatever reason, the Medicare contractor finds that a written agreement is not in accordance with CMS policy, if the hospital can demonstrate that it paid for the nonhospital training (and the payments represent all or substantially all of the cost of the training program in accordance with our regulations) by the end of the third month following the month in which the training occurred, then, assuming the other requirements are met, we would allow the hospital to count the FTE resident time spent training in the nonhospital setting for purposes of direct GME and IME payments.

Comment: One commenter asked if a hospital that first chooses one methodology of meeting the 90 percent threshold (that is, the proxy data or actual data), could later change to the other methodology to elicit a more favorable outcome. The commenter further inquired as to whether the hospital would be considered to have met the 90 percent threshold if it changes its methodology.

Response: As we stated previously in this preamble, we believe that any Medicare policy approach to allowing hospitals to count FTE residents training in nonhospital settings for IME and direct GME payment purposes must be consistent with the statutory requirement that hospitals incur ''all, or substantially all'' of the costs of a training program in a nonhospital setting. Further, we continue to believe that the definition of ''all, or substantially all'' of the costs which entails documentation of and payment for the costs of a training program based on the actual costs of the program is truest to the intent of the statute. Yet, as we explained, the alternative methodology, which attempts to address the various administrative difficulties that could occur in documenting actual costs and which employs proxies in the place of actual data, is acceptable as well. However, we certainly would not encourage hospitals to make a practice of using one methodology during the applicable academic year, and attempting to switch to the other methodology during audit to determine if they met the 90 percent threshold under the latter methodology. Nevertheless, if for example, during an audit, a Medicare contractor determines that a hospital did not pay for the costs of a particular program in accordance with the 90 percent threshold calculated using one method, and the hospital requests that it be allowed to attempt to demonstrate that it properly paid the costs had the other method been used, the Medicare contractor should contact CMS to determine on whether the hospital met the regulations under the other method. However, we caution that, even if CMS does allow a hospital the opportunity to demonstrate that it met the regulations under the other method, this may not necessarily provide the escape from an impending disallowance that a hospital is seeking. Payment for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs must be made in a timely fashion in accordance with the regulations at section 413.100(c)(2)(i) in either case, and it could be difficult for the hospital to meet those requirements if it did not initially determine and pay the actual costs of the program. Moreover, it could be difficult for the hospital to identify actual costs several years after the training occurred, especially since the teaching physician probably would not have kept records on the amount of time spent with the residents in nonpatient care direct GME activities. For example, a hospital initially used actual data to determine that 90 percent of the total costs of a program in a particular nonhospital site is $70,000. The hospital identified the costs as being $70,000 in the written agreement and liquidated the costs in a timely fashion in accordance with the regulations at section 413.100(c)(2)(i) (that is, within one year after the end of the cost reporting period in which the liability is incurred). However, during audit, the FI determined that the actual costs of the program were $75,000, not $70,000, which means the hospital did not pay 90 percent of the costs of the program. The hospital requests that it be allowed to demonstrate that it paid at least 90 percent of the costs of the program as calculated based upon the proxies instead, and CMS permits the hospital to do so. If the hospital shows that 90 percent of the cost of the program based on the proxies was $70,000 or less, then it may be considered to have paid ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the program. However, if the hospital, as verified by the Medicare contractor, demonstrates that 90 percent of the costs using proxies was $73,000, then in either case, the hospital would not have paid ''all or substantially all'' of the costs. The hospital would not, in all likelihood, be able to resolve the problem by paying the difference ($3,000) at the time of the audit since the timeframe for liquidating the liabilities may have passed. If the reverse situation had occurred, where the hospital first used proxies, but then requested to demonstrate that it would meet the 90 percent threshold if actual data were used, as explained above, we believe it would be quite difficult for the hospital to be able to successfully identify the actual costs of the program several years after the fact. In any case, the hospital would not be allowed to count the FTE residents training in the nonhospital site unless it ultimately demonstrates that it incurred all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital site in accordance with the definition at section 413.75(b) of the regulations (that

is, 90 percent). We would also apply this principle in determining whether the hospital actually incurred 90 percent of the costs of the training program in a nonhospital site in the instance where the amount ultimately paid by the hospital differs from the amount specified in the written agreement. If the amount paid by the hospital is at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities, then, assuming all other requirements are met, the hospital may count the FTE residents training in the program at the nonhospital site.

Comment: A commenter noted that the requirement that a hospital must liquidate the costs identified in the written agreement in accordance with the regulations at section 413.100(c)(2)(i) only applies in the case where a hospital enters into a written agreement with the nonhospital site, but does not apply in the instance where a hospital chooses to pay the nonhospital site on a concurrent basis. The commenter recommended that the requirements for liquidation of liabilities be consistent for both situations (that is, with or without a written agreement).

Response: Under the Medicare payment rules at § 413.100 concerning accrued costs, hospitals are required to liquidate their short-term liabilities within one year after the end of the cost reporting period in which the liability is incurred. With respect to the payments that hospitals make to nonhospital sites, in the August 11, 2004 final rule (69 FR 49179), in an effort to provide more flexibility to hospitals, we gave hospitals the option of either entering into a written agreement, or paying for the costs on a concurrent basis—that is, to pay for the costs of the training that occurs during a month by the end of the third month following the month in which the training in the nonhospital site occurred. The latter option (that is, concurrent payments) would require that payments be made on a more frequent basis than the timeframe specified at § 413.100(c)(2)(i). Alternatively, if a hospital opts to enter into written agreements, since the hospital would be committing upfront to incur the costs, the longer timeframe at § 413.100(c)(2)(i) would apply. Consequently, under the written agreement option, in order for the accrued costs to be recognized by Medicare in the year of the accrual, the costs incurred in a given cost reporting year for nonhospital training must be liquidated within one year after the end of that cost reporting period. For example, if a hospital has a December 31, 2007 fiscal year end, costs that the hospital incurred for nonhospital training occurring during July 2007 through December 2007 must be liquidated by December 31, 2008. Costs incurred by this hospital for nonhospital training occurring during January 2008 through June 2008 would accrue during the December 31, 2008 fiscal year end and must be liquidated by December 31, 2009. We believe these two options at § 413.78(e) and (f) give hospitals additional flexibility in paying for the costs of training occurring in nonhospital settings. Therefore, we are not changing the regulations to require that the liquidation of liabilities be consistent in both situations.

Comment: One commenter asked about our policy for nonhospital sites that are owned by a hospital, as articulated in the April 2005 Qs & As document. The document (under Answer #8) states that the hospital must ''actually [pay] the nonhospital site through the hospital's accounts payable system. (If the hospital and nonhospital site share a single accounting system, the hospital could demonstrate payment of the nonhospital site training program costs using journal entries that expense these costs in the hospital's GME cost center and credit the nonhospital site.)''

The commenter stated that we do not provide any rationale for this position, which seems to impose an administrative burden on hospitals (requiring the hospital to essentially pay itself). The commenter urged CMS to state in the final rule that these teaching hospitals need not specify the supervisory teaching physician costs in the written agreement because the teaching hospitals either own the nonhospital site or both institutions are owned by the same organization.

Response: We agree with the commenters that the proposal to require hospitals to include the details of the 90 percent cost threshold in the written agreement might be unnecessarily burdensome for hospitals that own nonhospital sites in which residents are training. While the hospital certainly must pay for the costs of training (in accordance with the 90 percent threshold) occurring in the nonhospital sites that it owns in order to be permitted to count the time residents spend training there for direct GME and IME purposes, the written agreements between the hospital and the nonhospital sites it owns need not specify the total amount of costs the hospital will incur, and what costs are included in that total amount. However, we note that there may be some cases where the hospital is not automatically paying for the training program costs in the nonhospital sites it owns, simply because it owns those nonhospital sites. For example, there may be instances where a hospital contracts with a third party to provide teaching physicians to supervise its residents in the hospital-owned nonhospital sites. In such a case, the teaching physicians are paid a salary by that third party (for example, they are on the staff of a medical school). Therefore, in this case, the written agreement would need to be between the hospital on behalf of the clinics that it owns and the third party, and the written agreement must specify the total cost at the nonhospital site, and the amount the hospital will incur (at least 90 percent of the total), and must indicate the portion of the amount the hospital will incur that reflects residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of this amount that reflects teaching physician compensation.

Comment: One commenter noted that the regulations concerning written agreements at section 413.78(e)(3)(ii) state that the hospital must provide ''reasonable compensation'' to the nonhospital site, while the regulations concerning concurrent payments have no requirement regarding the reasonableness of the compensation. The commenter recommended that CMS make the regulations for written agreements and concurrent payments consistent, by either inserting a requirement for reasonableness of compensation for both circumstances, or excluding the requirement under both circumstances.

Response: The commenter is referring to the regulations at section 413.78(e)(3) pertaining to the requirements for counting residents training in nonhospital settings on or after October 1, 2004. However, we believe the commenters point regarding the regulatory requirement for ''reasonableness'' of compensation is not a concern under the new regulation. Although the new section 413.78(f), effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, does not specifically refer to reasonableness of compensation, it requires that the costs of the training program be determined in accordance with the 90 percent threshold. Additionally, we note that the reference in the regulation at § 413.78(e)(3)(ii) to reasonable compensation was intended as a guide for the content of the written agreement and as a preface to the requirement to specify in the written agreement the

amount of compensation the hospital is providing for supervisory teaching activities. Given that, and the fact that the regulation at § 413.78(e) will not apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, we do not believe it is necessary to modify this section of the regulations.

Comment: One commenter believes that since residency training is the final educational step before a resident is capable of independent practice, residents are students and not employees, and therefore, CMS should refer to resident *stipends* and not resident *salaries.*

Response: We acknowledge that there are multiple terms to refer to the compensation a resident receives while participating in a residency training program. For our purposes, we have always referred to the compensation received by residents as salary and benefits, and will continue to do so even though different terms may be used by other organizations and entities.

Comment: Several commenters inquired about whether a hospital must comply with the nonhospital site regulations for training residents in a nonhospital setting with respect to FTE residents that are not counted for purposes of Medicare IME or direct GME payments because they are in excess of the hospital's FTE resident caps. These commenters further inquired about whether such a hospital could still include the FTEs in excess of its cap on its cost report even if the hospital didn't comply with the regulations for training those FTE residents in nonhospital settings. The commenters believe that hospitals should be able to include those residents in their current year FTE counts on their cost reports based on the reasoning that, in the event the Congress makes a legislative change regarding FTE resident caps, the cost reports would reflect an accurate count of the residents that the hospital trained.

Response: The regulations specify what a hospital must do to count residents that train at a nonhospital site for purposes of both direct GME and IME. If the hospital fails to meet the regulatory requirements at § 412.105(f) and § 413.78(f), it may not include those residents in its FTE count, regardless of whether the hospital is otherwise above or below its caps. However, a hospital may choose not to pay for the costs relating to the training of residents in a nonhospital setting if it is training FTE residents in excess of its caps, and therefore, would also not include those FTE residents training in nonhospital sites in its FTE count. With respect to FTE residents that a hospital does count on its Medicare cost report (for example, on line 3.05 on Worksheet E–3 Part IV, and on line 3.08 on Worksheet E Part A), a hospital must have proper documentation to demonstrate that the FTE residents are valid FTEs that, in the absence of the FTE caps, would otherwise be permitted to be counted for direct GME and IME payment purposes. Therefore, a hospital may only claim residents training at nonhospital sites on its cost report if the hospital would, in the absence of the FTE caps, be permitted to count those FTE residents for direct GME and IME payment purposes, even if those residents would be over its caps. We recognize the issues that could arise if hospitals choose not to take the required steps under our regulations to be permitted to count certain FTE residents, and if the Congress should pass new legislation involving residency caps. However, we believe it is more likely than not that new legislation would be based on the premise that hospitals have properly complied with the regulations and reported accurate data on their cost reports regardless of whether it was to their particular benefit to do so at the time. Thus, we would encourage hospitals to meet the regulatory requirements and report FTE residents to the fullest possible extent.

Comment: Several commenters stated that our policy would continue to be administratively burdensome. One commenter stated that for its family medicine program, private physicians are used as preceptors and in 1 week residents may work with 10 to 20 teaching physicians. The commenter states that, ''It would be administratively impossible to calculate all of their supposed teaching costs.'' Another commenter noted that its teaching program relies on 20 to 30 private teaching physicians who volunteer their time training residents in their offices. The commenter stated that due to the flow of patient care, without the use of burdensome time studies, it would be impossible to accurately determine the amount of GME teaching time at the nonhospital site. The commenter requested that we work more closely with program directors to formulate a methodology which addresses the true costs of GME.

Response: We believe that use of the proxies being adopted in this final rule, coupled with the 1:1 resident to teaching physician ratio, can greatly reduce the burdens associated with determining teaching physician supervisory GME costs, even in the relatively complex training arrangements described by the commenters. Although we acknowledge that hospitals with multiple nonhospital sites may face a larger task to comply with our regulations than hospitals with just a few nonhospital sites, we continue to believe the statute mandates that hospitals are required to pay for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the training program at the nonhospital site, and that this final policy conforms with the statutory requirement while providing additional administrative flexibility.

Comment: One commenter noted that in the proposed rule, CMS used the terms ''direct GME activities,'' ''nonpatient care activities,'' as well as ''activities related to non-billable GME activities'' in illustrating activities for which it is required that hospitals pay supervisory costs. The commenter urged CMS to consider including a definition in the final rule.

Response: We appreciate the commenter's suggestion to define terms such as those included in the above paragraph. We did not propose to define these terms since we did not believe it would be necessary to include a definition in the rule. However, we do believe it is important to be consistent in the way we reference those activities for which the hospital is required to incur the costs in the nonhospital site—that is, nonpatient care direct GME activities. While we do not currently specifically define ''nonpatient care direct GME activities'' in the regulations, we note that the term ''patient care activities'' is currently defined at § 413.75(b) as, ''the care and treatment of particular patients, including services for which a physician or other practitioner may bill.'' Therefore, the use of the term ''nonpatient care'' would denote those activities which do not involve the care and treatment of specific patients, including non-billable time. Further, the term ''direct GME'' denotes those activities in which the physician engages because of his/her involvement in supervising residents in an approved GME program. We are also modifying our proposed definition of ''*All or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting*'' at § 413.75(b) to specify the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to ''nonpatient care'' direct GME ''activities.'' If we find that there are continuing questions regarding these terms, we will consider proposing definitions in future rulemaking so that the proposed definitions can be included in the normal comment process.

Comment: One commenter maintained that CMS' interpretation of

Section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Act is not correct. The commenter believes that the statutory language does not prohibit payment to the ''main'' teaching hospital if it incurs ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of the residency training in ''small, rural emergency departments'' since the residents ''* * * are not serving in more than one hospital 'simultaneously.' '' The commenter further notes that few small rural hospitals want to assume the burden of becoming teaching hospitals, therefore, the main teaching hospital continues to bear the costs of the resident rotations to the rural emergency departments. The commenter urges CMS to change its policy with regard to ''emergency and possibly other hospital-based physicians'' to allow for payment to the ''main'' teaching hospital for resident training time at rural hospitals.

Response: We did not propose to make any changes to our regulations concerning the counting of FTE residents training in more than one hospital. Therefore, we believe the comments are out of the scope of this rule and we will not be responding to them at this time.

Comment: One commenter stated ''CMS currently insists that the three-month (90 day) timeframe for payment be based on a calendar month without regard to programs such as ours that conduct rotations on a 4-week basis (13 rotations per year) * * * We believe the written agreement is reasonable but the 90 day time frame for payment to the non-hospital physician should be relative to the last day of the block rotation.''

Response: We did not propose making any changes to CMS' rules regarding concurrent payment for training at nonhospital sites and, therefore, we believe this comment is outside the scope of our proposed rule and we will not be responding to it at this time.

Comment: One commenter asked ''How is CMS going to ensure responsible and consistent application of these lengthy new rules?''

Response: CMS typically will instruct its contractors as to the implementation of any new regulatory provisions. We intend to do the same for these provisions. We urge any individuals, including both members of the teaching hospital community and Medicare contractors, to contact us when they have questions regarding application of this rule.

Comment: We received several comments on the IME formula and other nonhospital site issues that were not included in the proposed rule.

Response: Since these comments are out of the scope of this rule, we are not responding to them at this time.

Comment: Several commenters requested that hospitals have the option of recalculating their PRA to include allowable GME costs.

Response: We did not propose any changes to the existing methodology for calculating GME PRAs. Therefore, we believe this comment is outside the scope of our proposed rule, and therefore, we are not responding to it in this final rule.

D. Summary of Final Provisions

In summary, we are revising § 413.75(b) to modify the definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' to reflect the policies in place between January 1, 1999 and July 1, 2007, and our policy for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. We are revising the definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' to mean: (a) Effective on or after January 1, 1999 and for cost reporting periods beginning before July 1, 2007, the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries and fringe benefits attributable to direct graduate medical education (GME); and (b) effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities.

In addition, we are revising § 412.105(f)(1)(ii)(C) for IME and adding § 413.78(f) to reflect the revised requirement to pay ''all or substantially all'' of the GME costs in a nonhospital site, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007. In this final rule, we are also clarifying the regulations text at § 413.78(f)(3)(ii) to specify that the written agreement must be in place between the hospital and the nonhospital site before the training begins in that nonhospital site. We are also specifying in the regulations text of this final rule that the written agreement should include the amount that represents the total cost of the training program in the nonhospital site, in addition to including the amount that the hospital will incur (at least 90 percent of the cost), and must indicate the portion of the amount that reflects residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of the amount that reflects teaching physician compensation. Lastly, we are revising the regulations text to indicate that the amounts specified in the written agreement may be modified by June 30 of the applicable academic year.

XIII. Technical Amendment

In the Revisions to Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems—FY 2007 final rule (71 FR 47870 through 48136), in an amendatory instruction to § 412.22(h)(3), we inadvertently omitted the words ''introductory text.'' Therefore, paragraphs § 412.22(h)(3)(i) and (ii) were removed. We are replacing § 412.22(h)(3)(i) and (ii) in this final rule.

XIV. Collection of Information Requirements

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are required to provide 30-day notice in the **Federal Register** and solicit public comment before a collection of information requirement is submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. In order to fairly evaluate whether an information collection should be approved by OMB, section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires that we solicit comment on the following issues:

- The need for the information collection and its usefulness in carrying out the proper functions of our agency.
- The accuracy of our estimate of the information collection burden.
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.
- Recommendations to minimize the information collection burden on the affected public, including automated collection techniques.

We solicited public comments on each of these issues for the following sections of this document that contain information collection requirements.

Section 413.78 Direct GME Payments: Determination of the Total Number of FTE Residents.

Section 413.78(f) outlines the requirements that must be met for the time residents spend in non-provider settings to be included in determining the number of FTE residents used in the computation of a hospital's resident count. A resident must spend his or her time in patient care activities; the hospital must incur substantially all of the costs of the training program in a nonhospital setting.

In addition, § 413.78(f)(3) requires that a hospital comply with one of the two requirements listed in § 413.78(f)(3)(i) and § 413.78(f)(3)(ii).

Section § 413.78(f)(3)(i) states that a hospital must document that it is paying for all or substantially all of the costs associated with the training program in a nonhospital setting. The costs must be incurred between the training date and the end of the third month after the training date. The burden associated with this requirement is the time and effort associated with documenting and maintaining records of the incurred costs and subsequent payments made by a hospital.

Section 413.78(f)(3)(ii) states that a hospital must have a written agreement with the nonhospital site. The agreement must state that the hospital will incur at least 90 percent of the cost of the resident's salary and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging, where applicable) while the resident is training in the nonhospital site and the portion of the cost of the teaching physician's salary that is attributable to GME. The written agreement must also specify the compensation amount the hospital is paying the nonhospital site, and whether this amount reflects only residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging, where applicable), or includes an amount for teaching physician compensation. The burden associated with this requirement is the time and effort associated with drafting, signing, and maintaining the written agreement.

The requirements listed in § 413.78(f)(3)(i) and § 413.78(f)(3)(ii) are exempt from the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 in accordance with Pub. L. 99–272.

We will be submitting a copy of this final rule to OMB for its review of the information collection requirements described above. These requirements are not effective until they have been approved by OMB.

XV. Regulatory Impact Analysis

A. Introduction

We have examined the impacts of this final rule as required by Executive Order 12866 (September 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review), the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (September 19, 1980, Pub. L. 96–354), section 1102(b) of the Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104–4), and Executive Order 13132.

1. Executive Order 12866

Executive Order 12866 (as amended by Executive Order 13258, which merely assigns responsibility of duties) directs agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). A regulatory impact analysis (RIA) must be prepared for major rules with economically significant effects ($100 million or more in any one year). We are using the rates, factors and policies presented in this final rule, including updated wage index values, and the best available claims and CCR data to estimate the change in payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Based on the best available data for 377 LTCHs, we estimate that the expansion of the existing payment provision for co-located LTCHs (HwHs and satellites of LTCHs) at existing § 412.534 to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs (as discussed in section V.B. of the preamble of this final rule), in conjunction with the update to the Federal rate for RY 2008 (discussed in section IV.C. of the preamble of this final rule), the changes to the area wage adjustment (discussed in section IV.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule), the revision to the SSO policy and the increase in the outlier fixed-loss amount (discussed in section IV.D.3.c. of the preamble of this final rule) for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, will result in a decrease in estimated payments from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year of approximately $156 million (or about 3.8 percent). (An estimate of Medicare program payments for LTCH services for the next 5 years is shown in section IV.D.5. of the preamble of this final rule. The impact of the policy change relating to payment for Hospital Direct and Indirect Graduate Medical Education Payments (GME) is discussed in section XV.C.2. of this regulatory impact analysis.) The estimated impact of the provisions presented in this final rule (as detailed above) for the 377 LTCHs in our database are in Table 9.

TABLE 9.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS FINAL RULE [1]

Policy	Estimated percent change in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments (percent)
Payment Rate and Policy Changes:	
Changes to the Federal Rate [2]	0.6
Changes to the Area Wage Adjustment	−1.0
Revision of the SSO Policy	−0.9
Adjustment of the High Cost Outlier Threshold [3]	−2.5
Subtotal [4]	−3.8
Expansion of the "25 Percent" Policy [5]	0
Total [6] (−3.8% + 0%)	−3.8

[1] Percent change in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year based on the best available data for 377 LTCHs.

[2] As discussed in greater detail in section XV.B.4. of this regulatory impact analysis, about 34 percent of all LTCH cases are projected to receive a payment under the existing SSO policy that is based either on the estimated cost of the case or the "IPPS comparable amount" (rather than the Federal rate). Therefore, the percent change in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments due to the changes to the Federal rate, 0.61 percent, is slightly less than the update to the Federal rate of 0.71 percent.

[3] This estimated 2.5 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 is due to the changes in the fixed-loss amount resulting from the use of more recent LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case.

[4] We also note that the estimated percent change for all payment rate and policy changes may not exactly equal the sum of the estimated percent change for the changes to the Federal rate, the changes to the area wage adjustment and the revision of the SSO policy due to the effect of estimated changes in aggregate HCO payments, as well as other interactive effects that cannot be isolated.

[5] Expansion of the existing special payment provision for co-located LTCHs (HwHs and satellites of LTCHs) at existing § 412.534 to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs (as discussed in section V.B. of the preamble of this final rule).

[6] Total estimated impact of the provisions of this final rule (that is, sum of the estimated impact of the payment rate and policy change, including the revision of the SSO policy, and the estimated impact of the expansion of the ''25 percent'' policy).

Because the combined distributional effects and estimated changes to the Medicare program payments would be greater than $100 million, this final rule would be considered a major economic rule, as defined in this section. We note the $156 million (or 3.8 percent) decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments resulting from the provisions presented in this final rule does not reflect changes in LTCH admissions or case-mix intensity in estimated LTCH PPS payments, which would also affect overall payment changes.

2. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

The RFA requires agencies to analyze options for regulatory relief of small entities. For purposes of the RFA, small entities include small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions. Most hospitals and most other providers and suppliers are small entities, either by nonprofit status or by having revenues of $6.5 million to $31.5 million in any 1 year. For purposes of the RFA, proprietary hospitals are small entities if they meet the small business size standard described above (for further information, see the Small Business Administration's regulation at 70 FR 72577, December 6, 2003). Because we lack data on individual hospital receipts, we cannot determine the number of small proprietary LTCHs. Therefore, we assume that all LTCHs are considered small entities for the purpose of the analysis that follows. Medicare FIs are not considered to be small entities. Individuals and States are not included in the definition of a small entity.

Currently, our database of 377 LTCHs includes the data for 83 non-profit (voluntary ownership control) LTCHs and 254 proprietary LTCHs. Of the remaining 40 LTCHs, 14 LTCHs are Government-owned and operated and the ownership type of the other 26 LTCHs is unknown (as shown in Table 11). The impact of the payment rate and policy changes for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (including the update to the Federal rate, changes to the area wage adjustment, and the revision of the SSO policy) is discussed in section XV.B.4.c. of this regulatory impact analysis. The impact of other policy changes, such as the effects of the expansion of the special payment provisions for LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites to certain situations not presently covered by § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs, is discussed in section XV.C. of this regulatory impact analysis.

As we discuss in detail throughout the preamble of this final rule, based on the most recent available LTCH data, we believe that although the provisions of this final rule would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, we believe the resulting LTCH PPS payment amounts result in appropriate Medicare payments. However, we believe that although appropriate, the provisions of this final rule could have a significant impact on some small entities (as defined above in this section). As also discussed in greater detail below in this section, we are unable to determine how significant the impact of some of the provisions of this final rule may be on small entities since we expect many LTCHs to adjust their admission practices in implementation of these provisions. We note that LTCHs have been adapting their behavior in response to the policy changes we have implemented over the past few years (for example, the annual update to the LTC–DRG relative weights, the ''25 percent policy'' at existing § 412.534, the revision to the SSO payment formula at existing § 412.529(c)(2), and the zero percent update to the RY 2007 Federal rate). Although those policy changes were projected to result in decreases in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, the growth in the number of LTCHs has continued (although at a reduced rate). Based on the most recent available OSCAR data, the number of LTCHs has increased over 10 percent in the past 2 years (from October 1, 2004 and October 1, 2006). Because we acknowledge that many of the affected entities are small entities, the analysis discussed throughout the preamble of this final rule, in conjunction with the discussion presented in greater detail below in this section and throughout the remainder of this regulatory impact analysis, constitutes our initial analysis under the RFA.

As shown in Table 9, we estimate that the provisions of this final rule could result in approximately a 3.8 percent (or $156 million) decrease in estimated payments per discharge in the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, on average, to all LTCHs. Table 9 shows that the payment rate and policy changes are projected to result in a 3.8 percent decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, and the expansion of the ''25 percent'' policy is projected to result in neither an increase nor a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments. Thus, while a significant portion of the approximately 3.8 percent decrease in estimated aggregate payments in the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as compared to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year would not be due to the expansion of the special payment provisions for co-located LTCHs to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs (as discussed in section V.B. of this final rule), this is due to our adoption of a 3 year transition to this policy. However, as that policy is fully implemented at 25 percent (or the applicable level) there will be a significant impact in LTCH payments. We predict the 5 year impact of this policy to be as shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Rate year	''25 Percent'' policy with 3 year transition (expressed in millions)*
2008	0
2009	20
2010	110
2011	160
2012	170
Total	460

* Projected decrease in estimated aggregate payments in the LTCH PPS rate years for 5 years due to the expansion of the special payment provisions for co-located LTCHs to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs (as discussed in section V.B. of this final rule).

As discussed in greater detail in section XV.C.1. of this regulatory impact analysis, because we believe that this policy would discourage inappropriate patient shifting to LTCHs and would encourage all subclause (I) LTCHs to engage in more appropriate admission policies since, no payment adjustment would be made if the patient has reached HCO status at the co-located host (under the revision to § 412.534) or at the referring hospital (under § 412.536) prior to being admitted for additional post-acute care at the LTCH (as discussed in greater detail in section V.B. of this final rule) since patients who achieved HCO status prior to admission to the LTCH will not be counted toward the applicable threshold

under § 412.536 or under the revision to § 412.534 (although the admission would still be counted toward the LTCH's total Medicare discharges). Because we expect that such a policy would reduce the financial incentives that may be present currently for certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 to admit patients prematurely discharged from other hospitals, we believe this policy would result in fewer admissions to LTCHs before a complete course of patient care is provided at the non-co-located referring hospital (under § 412.536) or co-located referring hospital (under the revision to § 412.534). Thus, any change in admission practices as a result of this policy would result in less of a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments once this policy is fully implemented at 25 percent (or the applicable level). Thus, the projected decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments resulting from this policy change would only occur if there were no changes in LTCH admission practices. Furthermore, we believe that this policy would result in appropriate Medicare payments since, as noted above, we expect that such a policy would reduce the financial incentives to admit patients prematurely discharged from other hospitals and would encourage all LTCHs to engage in more appropriate admission policies. For these reasons, although we estimate that this policy would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments beginning in the second year of the transition, we do not believe that such a projected decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, although possibly significant, would adversely affect LTCHs' ability to deliver efficient care to Medicare beneficiaries nor would there be an adverse affect on Medicare beneficiaries' access to care.

Additionally, as shown in Table 9, we project an estimated 2.5 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 due to the changes in the fixed-loss amount resulting from the use of more recent LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case. That is, as discussed in detail previously in the preamble of this final rule, to determine the proposed fixed-loss amount for RY 2008 of $18,778, we used claims data from the March 2006 update of the FY 2005 MedPAR file and CCRs from the July 2006 update of the provider specific file (PSF), as that was the best available data at that time. However, to determine the fixed-loss amount for RY 2008 in this final rule, the most recent available data are the December 2006 update of the FY 2006 MedPAR claims data and the CCRs from the December 2006 update of the PSF. Our analysis of the FY 2006 claims data showed that, in general, the average cost per case has increased as compared to the FY 2005 claims data. If we had kept the fixed loss amount at $18,778, it would have caused the estimated aggregate high-cost outlier payments to exceed the 8 percent regulatory limit. In fact, our analysis shows that if we were to apply the proposed fixed-loss amount of $18,774, we estimate that outlier payments would be over 9 percent of total estimated LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. Similarly, to determine the fixed-loss amount for RY 2007 of $14,887, we used the December 2005 update of the FY 2005 MedPAR claims data and the CCRs from the December 2005 update of the PSF, as that was the best available data at that time. Based on the most recent updated claims and CCR data available to us at the time of this final rule, we estimate that the current fixed-loss amount (RY 2007, $14,887) would result in an aggregate outlier payment amount of 10.3 percent. As discussed in previously of this rule, when we implemented the LTCH PPS, under the HCO policy we established the aggregate outlier payment amount at 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments to allow us to achieve a balance between the need to protect hospitals with costly cases while providing an incentive for hospitals to operate efficiently. An aggregate outlier payment amount in excess of 8 percent would not allow us to achieve this goal. Consequently, while increasing the fixed-loss amount to $22,954 is projected to result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments of 2.5 percent, we believe that this is necessary in order to maintain the aggregate outlier payment amount at the appropriate 8 percent. Furthermore, hospitals are aware of our longstanding policy which limits high-cost outlier payments to 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments. For these reasons, although we estimate that the change in the fixed-cost amount would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, we do not believe that such an impact on estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would adversely affect LTCHs' ability to deliver efficient care to Medicare beneficiaries nor would there be an adverse affect on Medicare beneficiaries' access to care.

The impact analysis of payment rate and policy changes in Table 11 shows that estimated payments per discharge are expected to decrease approximately 3.8 percent, on average, for all LTCHs from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year as compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Although we are finalizing a 3.8 percent decrease to the Federal rate for RY 2008 (as discussed in section IV.C. of this final rule), the projected percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year is attributable to the changes to the area wage adjustment (discussed in section IV.D.1. of this final rule), the revision of the SSO policy discussed in section V.A.2. of this final rule, as well as the increase to the HCO fixed-loss amount (as discussed in section IV.D.3.c. of this final rule). (As discussed in greater detail in section XV.B.4., the impact due to the expansion of the ''25 percent policy'' to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs is not reflected in Table 11. However, as noted above, the impact of that policy is discussed in greater detail in section XV.C.1. of this regulatory impact analysis.)

As the impact analysis in Table 11 shows, estimated changes to the area wage adjustment from RY 2007 to RY 2008 (resulting from both established policy and changes presented in section IV.D.1. of this final rule, as discussed in greater detail below in this section) contribute to the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. As discussed in section IV.D.1. of this final rule, we are updating the wage index values for RY 2008, in accordance with the progression of the existing 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment, based on the most recent available wage data. We believe that updating the LTCH PPS wage index based on the most recent available wage data would ensure that the LTCH PPS wage index adjustment appropriately accounts for and reflects the relative hospital wage levels in the geographic area of the hospital as compared to the national average hospital wage level. In addition, we are increasing the labor-related share from 75.665 percent to 75.788 percent under the LTCH PPS for RY 2008 based on the most recent available data on the relative importance of the labor-related share of operating and capital costs of the LTCH PPS market basket (also discussed in section IV.D.1. of this final rule). We believe that revising the labor-related share based on the most recent available data would appropriately identify the portion of the LTCH PPS Federal rate that is adjusted to account for geographic differences in area wage levels by applying the applicable LTCH PPS wage index value. As discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.1. of this

final rule, we believe that these changes to the LTCH PPS area wage adjustment based on the most recent available wage data and data on the relative importance of the labor-related share of the LTCH PPS market basket, respectively, would result in appropriate and accurate LTCH PPS payments for the resources used by LTCHs in a given area. Such updated data appropriately reflects national differences in area wage levels and identifies the portion of the Federal rate that should be adjusted to account for such differences in area wages.

We also note that, even though we are not making any changes to the existing 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment that was established when the LTCH PPS was implemented (August 30, 2002; 67 FR 56018), the continued progression of this phase-in also contributes to the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments for RY 2008. That is, since under the established phase-in of the wage-index adjustment, LTCHs receive an increasing percentage of the applicable full wage index value (which is less than 1.0 for the majority of LTCHs), we expect that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would decrease from RY 2007 to RY 2008 as a result of the progression of the existing 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment. Thus, the majority of the 1.0 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge, on average, for all LTCHs (see Table 11) is due to the existing 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment, and is not due to policy changes presented in this final rule. Because the existing 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment has been a feature of the LTCH PPS since it was implemented beginning October 1, 2002, and since a large majority (over 70 percent) of LTCHs are located in areas where historically the wage index value is less than 1.0, the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments resulting from this policy should be anticipated by LTCHs, and therefore, already accounted for in their fiscal planning. In addition, we note that, although the portion of the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that is due to the existing 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment is expected, we believe that any change in LTCHs' wage index values under this policy is appropriate since LTCHs will be receiving an increasing percentage of the applicable full wage index value, which, by definition, reflects the relative hospital wage levels for the area in which the LTCH is located as compared to the national average hospital wage level.

Because we cannot determine to what extent LTCHs may have planned for the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that is due to the existing 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment, even though the impact may be significant for some LTCHs, we believe that most LTCHs would not be adversely affected since, as explained above, we believe that the changes to the area wage adjustment (that is, the use of update wage data and the change in the labor-related share), in conjunction with the continued progression of the 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment, would result in appropriate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. For these reasons, we believe that the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments resulting from changes to the area wage adjustment, although possibly significant for some LTCHs, is appropriate and would not adversely affect LTCHs' ability to deliver efficient care to Medicare beneficiaries nor would there be an adverse affect on Medicare beneficiaries' access to care.

In addition, as also shown in Table 11, the revision of the SSO policy discussed in section V.A.2. of this final rule would also contribute to the estimated 3.8 percent decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008, on average, for all LTCHs. We believe that the LTCH cases that appear to be ''similar to'' the same type of cases treated in an acute care hospital and paid for under the IPPS, as discussed in greater detail in section V.A.2. of this final rule, would receive an appropriately adjusted LTCH PPS payment to treat such cases. We believe that those SSO cases that are ''similar to IPPS cases'' most likely do not receive a full course of an LTCH-level of treatment in such a short period of time since, in general, LTCHs are intended to treat longer stay patients. Although we project a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS with the revision of the SSO policy, we believe the change would result in appropriate and adequate Medicare payments for the treatment of Medicare beneficiaries with a LOS that is ''similar to'' typical IPPS cases.

Furthermore, we believe that, the revision to the SSO policy would accomplish our stated goal of removing the incentive for LTCHs to admit patients for whom a long-term hospital stay is not necessary, and therefore, for whom the LTCH would not be providing complete treatment. As noted previously, the vast majority of LTCH cases, including SSO cases, are admitted to the LTCH directly from an acute-care hospital, and therefore, many SSO cases may still be in need of acute-level care (as we discuss in greater detail in section V.A.2. of the preamble of this final rule). Therefore, we believe that in response to the revision of the SSO policy, LTCHs may reduce the number of SSO cases that are ''similar to IPPS cases'' that they admit (and most of those patients would continue to receive treatment at the acute-care hospital). To the extent that LTCHs continue to admit SSO cases that are ''similar to IPPS cases,'' we believe that this would result in an adjusted LTCH PPS payment that is appropriate.

For these reasons, although we estimate that the revision of the SSO policy would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, we do not believe that such an impact on estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, although possibly significant, would adversely affect LTCHs' ability to deliver efficient care to Medicare beneficiaries nor would there be an adverse affect on Medicare beneficiaries' access to care.

For all of the reasons discussed above in this section, although we do not expect an estimated incremental decrease of 3.8 percent (approximately $156 million) in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments to have a significant adverse financial impact on LTCHs, nor do we expect there would be an effect on beneficiaries' access to care, we acknowledge that the provisions of this final rule could have a significant impact on some small entities. However, we believe that the provisions of this final rule would result in appropriate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008. We also note that LTCHs provide some services to (and generate revenue from) patients other than Medicare beneficiaries and the revenue to LTCHs from treating those patients is not affected by this final rule. This analysis, in conjunction with the remainder of this section, demonstrates that this final rule is consistent with the regulatory philosophy and principles identified in the RFA. We believe the provisions presented in this final rule would affect payments to LTCHs, and the effects on some LTCHs, although they may be significant, are appropriate.

3. Impact on Rural Hospitals

Section 1102(b) of the Act requires us to prepare a regulatory impact analysis if a rule may have a significant impact on the operations of a substantial number of small rural hospitals. This analysis must conform to the provisions of section 604 of the RFA. For purposes of section 1102(b) of the Act, we define a small rural hospital as a hospital that is located outside of a Metropolitan Statistical Area and has fewer than 100

beds. As shown in Table 11, we are projecting a 6.2 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as compared to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year for rural LTCHs as a result of the payment rate changes, based on the data of the 23 rural LTCHs in our database of 377 LTCHs for which complete data were available.

As shown in Table 11, a significant portion of the estimated decrease in estimated LTCH PPS payments in the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as compared to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year for payment rate and policy changes for rural LTCHs is due to the change in the area wage adjustment (as discussed in greater detail in section V.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule). Specifically, although we are not making any changes to the existing 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment that was established when the LTCH PPS was implemented (August 30, 2002; 67 FR 56018), the continued progression of this phase-in contributes to the decrease in estimated payments to rural LTCHs for RY 2008. This is because, under the established phase-in of the wage-index adjustment, LTCHs receive an increasing percentage of the applicable full wage index value (which is less than 1.0 for *all* of the 23 rural LTCHs in our database), we expect that estimated payments per discharge for rural LTCHs would decrease from RY 2007 to RY 2008 as a result of the progression of the 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment. Thus, the majority of the projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge shown in Table 11 for rural LTCHs is due to the existing 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment, and is not due to policy changes presented in this final rule. We believe that the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments resulting from this existing policy should be anticipated by LTCHs, and therefore, already accounted for in their fiscal planning. In addition, we note that, although the portion of the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments that is due to this existing policy is expected, we believe that any change in LTCHs' wage index values due to the continued progression of the phase-in of the area wage adjustment is appropriate since LTCHs will be receiving an increasing percentage of the applicable full wage index value, which, by definition, reflects the relative hospital wage levels for the area in which the LTCH is located as compared to the national average hospital wage level.

Furthermore, as also explained in greater detail above, we believe that the changes to the area wage adjustment presented in this final rule (that is, the use of update wage data and the change in the labor-related share) would result in accurate and appropriate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008 since they are based on the most recent available data. Such updated data appropriately reflect national differences in area wage levels and identifies the portion of the Federal rate that should be adjusted to account for such differences in area wages, thereby resulting in accurate and appropriate LTCH PPS payments. Because we cannot determine to what extent LTCHs may have planned for the decrease in estimated aggregate RY 2008 LTCH PPS payments that results from the existing 5-year phase-in of the area wage adjustment, we believe that although the effects of the changes to the area wage adjustment on some rural LTCHs may be significant, most rural LTCHs should not be adversely affected because those changes are expected to result in appropriate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008.

We also believe that the expansion of the payment adjustment at existing § 412.534 to certain situations not presently covered by that policy for subclause (I) LTCHs may have a significant adverse impact on some rural LTCHs, although we cannot determine how significant for the reasons explained below in this section. Even though this policy, once it is fully implemented at 25 percent (or the applicable level), is estimated to reduce estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments and may result in a significant impact on some rural LTCHs, we also believe that such changes would result in appropriately adjusted LTCH PPS payments (as explained below in this section). As discussed in greater detail in section V.B. of this final rule, in designing features of the original ''25 percent policy'' for co-located LTCHs (HwHs and LTCH satellites), which we proposed to extend to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs, we provided special treatment for rural hospitals which would increase the threshold from 25 percent to 50 percent. When we established the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) payment adjustment for co-located LTCHs at existing § 412.534, after which this payment adjustment for situations not presently covered by that policy has been modeled, we noted in response to comments that ''the Congress has authorized special treatment for rural areas under the Medicare program because of the particular geographic and demographic challenges in those locations, as well as the difference between the provision and availability of medical services as compared to urban areas'' (69 FR 49206). Therefore, under our policy, we will apply the same rationale to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 that would occur in subclause (I) LTCHs that are located in rural areas. Accordingly, rather than a 25 percent threshold (as is being implemented for most urban LTCHs), for rural LTCHs, the payment adjustment will only be applied to those LTCH's or LTCH satellite facility's Medicare discharges that were admitted from a non-co-located referring hospital under § 412.536 or co-located host under the revision to § 412.534 that are in excess of 50 percent of the LTCH's total Medicare discharges for that hospital for any cost reporting period. Under this revision, consistent with the existing policy at § 412.534, no payment adjustment will be made if the patient has reached HCO status at the referring hospital (under § 412.536) or at the co-located host (under the revision to § 412.534) prior to being admitted for additional post-acute care at the LTCH. That is, in calculating the 50 percent threshold (for rural LTCHs), patients who achieved HCO status prior to admission to the LTCH will not be counted toward the applicable threshold under § 412.536 or under the revision to § 412.534 (although the admission would still be counted toward the LTCH's total Medicare discharges).

Furthermore, because such a policy would reduce the financial incentives for all LTCHs, including rural LTCHs, to admit patients prematurely discharged from other hospitals, we believe this policy will result in fewer admissions to LTCHs before a complete course of patient care is provided at the referring hospital. As noted above, any changes in admission practices as a result of this policy will result in less of a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments based on current admission practices. Thus, the decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments to rural LTCHs resulting from this policy change will only occur if there were no change in rural LTCH admission practices. It is our intention, under this policy, to discourage LTCHs from serving as ''step-down'' units after a patient has been diagnosed and received initial treatment at another hospital, a scenario that results in two Medicare payments (one to the referring hospital and one to the LTCH) for what was essentially one episode of patient care. Rather, it is our intent to encourage LTCHs to admit patients who required

additional long-stay hospital-level treatment following the provision of a full episode of care at the referring hospital. For those patients, under this policy Medicare would pay an unadjusted amount under the LTCH PPS. We believe that this policy would result in more appropriate admission policies by rural LTCHs. Therefore, we believe that although the effects on some rural LTCHs of the expansion of the payment adjustment at existing § 412.534 to certain situations not presently covered by that policy for subclause (I) LTCHs may be significant, most rural LTCHs will not be adversely affected because this policy change is expected to result in changes in admission practices and appropriate payments for such cases, as explained above in this section.

Additionally, according to our analysis, we project an estimated 2.8 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge to rural LTCHs from RY 2007 to RY 2008 due to the changes in the fixed-loss amount resulting from the use of more recent LTCH data to estimate the cost of each LTCH case. As discussed previously in this impact analysis regarding small entities, based on the most recent updated claims and CCR data, we increased the fixed-loss amount in order to maintain an aggregate outlier payment amount of 8 percent of estimated total payments. As discussed previously in this final rule, when we implemented the LTCH PPS, under the HCO policy we established the aggregate outlier payment amount at 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments to allow us to achieve a balance between the need to protect hospitals with costly cases while providing an incentive for hospitals to operate efficiently. An aggregate outlier payment amount in excess of 8 percent would not allow us to achieve this goal. Consequently, while the increase in the fixed-loss amount to $22,954 for RY 2008 is projected to result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments to rural hospitals by 2.8 percent, we believe that this is necessary in order to maintain the aggregate outlier payment amount at the appropriate 8 percent. Furthermore, hospitals are aware of our longstanding policy which limits high-cost outlier payments to 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments. For these reasons, although we estimate that the change in the fixed-loss amount would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments, we do not believe that such an impact on estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments would adversely affect LTCHs' ability to deliver efficient care to Medicare beneficiaries, nor would there be an adverse effect on Medicare beneficiaries' access to care.

In addition, the revision of the SSO policy will also contribute to the projected decrease in estimated payments to rural LTCHs for RY 2008. About 40 percent of rural LTCHs treat a larger than average percentage of SSO cases (in fact, based on FY 2005 data for a few rural LTCHs, SSO cases represent over half of their total cases). However, we are not able to determine whether the revision to the SSO policy would result in an adverse financial impact on rural LTCHs because we believe that most LTCHs (including rural LTCHs) would reduce the number of SSO cases that they admit that are ''similar to IPPS cases'' (as discussed in greater detail above). (We note that although we expect most LTCHs (including rural LTCHs) to admit fewer SSO cases under the revision of the SSO policy, most of those patients would continue to receive treatment at the acute-care hospital from which they are typically discharged immediately prior to their LTCH (short-stay) admission.) Thus, the projected 6.2 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge shown in Table 11 for rural LTCHs represents an average maximum reduction in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008, and since we anticipate that LTCHs (including rural LTCHs) would admit fewer SSO patients for whom payments would be affected by the revision of the SSO policy, we believe that the actual decrease in rural LTCHs' payments for RY 2008 would be less than the 6.2 percent decrease in estimated payments for RY 2008 shown in Table 11.

Furthermore, to the extent that rural LTCHs would continue to admit SSO cases with a LOS that is ''similar to IPPS cases,'' we believe the revision of the SSO policy will result in an appropriate adjusted LTCH PPS payment because we believe that many of those SSO cases most likely do not receive a full course of a LTCH-level of treatment in such a short period of time since, in general, LTCHs are intended to treat longer stay patients. Therefore, although we estimate the revision to the SSO policy could result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payment to rural LTCHs, we do not believe that such an estimated impact on rural LTCHs' LTCH PPS payments, even though possibly significant, would adversely affect most rural LTCHs because the revision would be expected to result in changes in admission practices and in appropriate payments for such cases.

For these reasons, we believe that there may be a significant impact on some rural LTCHs resulting from the changes present in this final rule. However, a portion of the decrease in rural LTCHs' estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 would be less than what we estimate based on current admission practices (as explained above in this section). We also believe (as discussed previously) a significant portion of the projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge for RY 2008, which is due to the established phase-in of the wage index adjustment, and the increased fix-loss amount in order to maintain the aggregate outlier payment amount of 8 percent, is not a result of a policy change, and may already be accounted for in LTCHs' fiscal plans. Therefore, although we believe this final rule would affect payments to rural LTCHs, and the effects on some rural LTCHs, although appropriate, may be significant, we are unable to determine how significantly the changes presented in this final rule, would adversely affect rural LTCHs. However, because we expect changes in admission practice and appropriate payments, (as discussed above), we do not anticipate that the provisions of this final rule would affect the ability of the vast majority of rural LTCHs to provide cost efficient services to Medicare patients nor do we expect there would be an adverse effect on beneficiaries' access to care. The analysis presented above, in conjunction with the remainder of this regulatory impact analysis, demonstrates that this final rule is consistent with the regulatory philosophy and principles identified in section 1102(b) of the Act. (For additional information on the estimated impact of the changes on rural LTCHs presented in this final rule, refer to section XV.B.4.a. of this regulatory impact analysis.)

4. Unfunded Mandates

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) also requires that agencies assess anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule whose mandates require spending in any one year of $100 million in 1995 dollars, updated annually for inflation. That threshold level is currently approximately $120 million. This final rule would not mandate any requirements for State, local, or tribal governments, nor would it result in expenditures by the private sector of $120 million or more in any 1 year.

5. Federalism

Executive Order 13132 establishes certain requirements that an agency

must meet when it publishes a final rule (and subsequent final rule) that imposes substantial direct requirement costs on State and local governments, preempts State law, or otherwise has Federalism implications.

We have examined this final rule under the criteria set forth in Executive Order 13132 and have determined that this final rule would not have any significant impact on the rights, roles, and responsibilities of State, local, or tribal governments or preempt State law, based on the 14 State and local LTCHs in our database of 377 LTCHs for which data were available.

6. Alternatives Considered

In the preamble of this final rule, we are setting forth the annual update to the payment rates for the LTCH PPS, as well as proposing other policy changes and discussing approaches for other areas of concern. In this preamble, we specify the statutory authority for the provisions that are presented, identify those policies when discretion has been exercised, and present rationale for our decisions, alternatives that were considered and solicit comments on suggested alternatives from commenters (where relevant).

B. Anticipated Effects of Payment Rate Changes

We discuss the impact of the changes to the payment rates, factors, and other payment rate policies presented in the preamble of this final rule in terms of their estimated fiscal impact on the Medicare budget and on LTCHs. (We note that the impact of other policy changes presented in this final rule, which do not directly affect the LTCH PPS per discharge payment rates (for example, the expansion of the existing payment provision for co-located LTCHs to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs discussed in section V.B. of this final rule and the policy change relating to GME payments discussed in section XII. of this final rule), are not included as part of the impact analysis shown in Table 11. However, the impact of certain other policies are discussed separately in section XV.C. of this regulatory impact analysis.

1. Budgetary Impact

Section 123(a)(1) of the BBRA requires that the PPS developed for LTCHs ''maintain budget neutrality.'' We believe that the statute's mandate for budget neutrality (BN) applies only to the first year of the implementation of the LTCH PPS (that is, FY 2003). Therefore, in calculating the FY 2003 standard Federal rate under § 412.523(d)(2), we set total estimated payments for FY 2003 under the LTCH PPS so that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS are estimated to equal the amount that would have been paid if the LTCH PPS had not been implemented. However, as discussed in greater detail in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56033 through 56036), the FY 2003 LTCH PPS standard Federal rate ($34,956.15) was calculated based on all LTCHs being paid 100 percent of the standard Federal rate in FY 2003. As discussed in section IV.D.5. of this final rule, during LTCH rate years governed by the 5-year transition period policy set forth at § 412.533(a), we applied a BN offset to payments to account for the monetary effect of the applicable transition period methodology (including the option to elect payments based on 100 percent of the Federal rate in lieu of the transition blend methodology) in a given LTCH PPS rate year. Specifically, for FY 2003 and RYs 2004 through 2007, the amount of the transition period BN offset was equal to 1 minus the ratio of the estimated payments based on 100 percent of the LTCH PPS Federal rate to the projected total Medicare program payments that would be made under the transition methodology and the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal prospective payment rate. However, as we discuss in greater detail in section IV.D.5. of this final rule, we are no longer projecting a small cost for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) even though some LTCH's will have a cost reporting period for the 5th year of the transition period which will be concluding in the first 3 months of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. Based on the most recent available data, we are projecting that the vast majority of LTCHs would have made the election to be paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate rather than the transition blend, which would result in a negligible cost to the Medicare program. Therefore, in this final rule, we did not propose a transition BN offset to all LTCH PPS payments for RY 2008 to account for the estimated cost of the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate) in RY 2008.

2. Impact on Providers

The basic methodology for determining a per discharge LTCH PPS payment is set forth in § 412.515 through § 412.525. In addition to the basic LTC–DRG payment (standard Federal rate multiplied by the LTC–DRG relative weight), we make adjustments for differences in area wage levels, COLA for Alaska and Hawaii, and SSOs. Furthermore, LTCHs may also receive HCO payments for those cases that qualify based on the threshold established each rate year.

To understand the impact of the changes to the LTCH PPS payment rates and payment rate policy changes discussed in sections IV. and V.A. of this final rule on different categories of LTCHs for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, it is necessary to estimate payments per discharge under the LTCH PPS rates, factors and policies established for RY 2007 (established in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27798 through 27939)) and to estimate payments per discharge that would be made under the LTCH PPS rates, factors and policies for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (as discussed in the preamble of this final rule). We also evaluated the change in estimated 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payments to estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments (on a per discharge basis) for each category of LTCHs.

Hospital groups were based on characteristics provided in the OSCAR data, FY 2002 through FY 2004 cost report data in HCRIS, and PSF data. Hospitals with incomplete characteristics were grouped into the ''unknown'' category. Hospital groups include:

- Location: Large Urban/Other Urban/Rural.
- Participation date.
- Ownership control.
- Census region.
- Bed size.

To estimate the impacts of the payment rates and payment rate policy changes among the various categories of existing providers, we used LTCH cases from the FY 2006 MedPAR file to estimate payments for RY 2007 and to estimate payments for RY 2008 for 377 LTCHs. While currently there are just under 400 LTCHs, the most recent growth is predominantly in for-profit LTCHs that provide respiratory and ventilator-dependent patient care. We believe that the discharges from the FY 2006 MedPAR data for the 377 LTCHs in our database, which includes 254 proprietary LTCHs, provide sufficient representation in the LTC–DRGs containing discharges for patients who received LTCH care for the most commonly treated LTCH patients' diagnoses.

As discussed in greater detail in section VII. of this final rule, under the 5-year transition set forth at § 412.533(a), a LTCH's total payment under the LTCH PPS was based on an increasing percentage of the Federal rate

with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of its LTCH PPS payment based on reasonable cost principles. However, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, total LTCH PPS payments are based entirely on the Federal rate. Therefore, even though some LTCHs will have a cost reporting period for the 4th year of the transition period that will be concluding in the first 3 months of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, the portion of those LTCHs' LTCH PPS payments that will be based on reasonable cost principles during RY 2008 is negligible relative to LTCH PPS payments based on the Federal rate. This is because, as discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.5. of this final rule, based on the most recent available data, we are projecting that the vast majority of LTCHs have already made the election to be paid based on 100 percent of the Federal rate rather than the transition blend prior to the start of their FY 2006 cost reporting period (that is, the 4th year of the transition period as set forth at § 412.533(a)), and even for those few remaining LTCHs paid under the transition blend methodology set forth at § 412.533(a), their total LTCH PPS payments are now based mostly on the Federal rate (since the transition blend percentages for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2006 are 80 percent of the Federal rate and 20 percent of the LTCH PPS payment based on reasonable cost principles). Therefore, in this final rule, we are no longer providing a separate impact table reflecting the applicable transition blend percentages, which required cost data to determine estimated LTCH PPS payments based on reasonable cost principles. Accordingly, the impact analyses of the payment rates and payment rate policy changes presented below reflects estimated LTCH PPS payments to all LTCHs based solely on the Federal rate.

These impacts reflect the estimated ''losses'' or ''gains'' among the various classifications of LTCHs for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007) compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) based on the payment rates and payment rate policy changes presented in this final rule. Prospective payments for the 2007 LTCH rate year were based on the standard Federal rate of $38,086.04, the outlier fixed-loss amount of $14,887, and the LTCHs' estimated case-mix based on FY 2006 LTCH claims data. Estimated prospective payments for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year would be based on the standard Federal rate of $38,356.45 (based on the 0.71 percent update discussed in section IV.C.3. of the preamble to this final rule), the outlier fixed-loss amount of $22,954, and the same FY 2006 LTCH claims data.

3. Calculation of Prospective Payments

To estimate per discharge payments under the LTCH PPS, we simulated payments on a case-by-case basis by applying the established (for RY 2007) and (for RY 2008) adjustments for area wage differences (as described in section IV.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule), and the COLA for Alaska and Hawaii (as described in section IV.D.2. of the preamble of this final rule). As discussed above, we also accounted for the existing payment policy for SSOs in RY 2007 and the revision of the SSO policy in RY 2008. Additional payments would also be made for HCOs (as described in section IV.D.3. of this final rule). As noted in section IV.D.4. of this final rule, we are not proposing to make adjustments for rural location, geographic reclassification, indirect medical education costs, or a DSH payment for the treatment of low-income patients because sufficient new data have not been generated that would enable us to conduct a comprehensive reevaluation of these payment adjustments.

We adjusted for area wage differences for estimated 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payments by computing a weighted average of a LTCH's applicable wage index during the period from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 because some providers may experience a change in the wage index phase-in percentage during that period. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2005, and before September 30, 2006 (FY 2006), the labor portion of the Federal rate is adjusted by four-fifths of the applicable LTCH PPS wage index. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, and before September 30, 2007 (FY 2007), the labor portion of the Federal rate is adjusted by five-fifths (that is, the full amount) of the applicable LTCH PPS wage index. Therefore, during RY 2007, a provider with a cost reporting period that began October 1, 2006, would have 3 months (July 2006 through September 2006) of payments under the four-fifths wage index value and 9 months (October 2006 through June 2007) of payment under the (full) five-fifths wage index value. For this provider, we computed a blended wage index of 25 percent (3 months/12 months) of the four-fifths wage index value and 75 percent (9 months/12 months) of the (full) five-fifths wage index value. The applicable LTCH PPS wage index values for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year are shown in Tables 1 and 2 of the Addendum to the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27906 through 27930). We adjusted for area wage differences for estimated 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payments using the current LTCH PPS labor-related share of 75.665 percent (71 FR 27830).

Similarly, we adjusted for area wage differences for estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments by computing a weighted average of a LTCH's applicable wage index during the period from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, because, although under the established phase-in of the wage index adjustment for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, the applicable LTCH wage index value is the full (five-fifths) LTCH PPS wage index value, during RY 2008 some providers will still experience a change in the wage index phase-in percentage during that period. For example, during RY 2008, a provider with a FY 2006 cost reporting period that began September 1, 2006, (and will end on August 31, 2007) would have 2 months (July 2007 and August 2007) of payments under the four-fifths wage index value and 10 months (September 2007 through June 2007) of payment under the (full) five-fifths wage index value. For this provider, we computed a blended wage index of 16.7 percent (2 months/12 months) of the four-fifths wage index value and 83.3 percent (10 months/12 months) of the (full) five-fifths wage index value. The applicable LTCH PPS wage index values for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year are shown in Tables 1 and 2 of Addendum A to this final rule. We adjusted for area wage differences for estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments using the LTCH PPS labor-related share of 75.511 percent (see section IV.D.1.c. of this final rule).

As noted previously in this final rule, under the 5-year transition set forth at § 412.533(a), a LTCH's total payment under the LTCH PPS was based on an increasing percentage of the Federal rate with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of the LTCH PPS payment that is based on reasonable cost principles. However, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2006, total LTCH PPS payments are based solely on the Federal rate. Therefore, even though some LTCHs will have a cost reporting period for the 4th year of the transition period that will be concluding in the first 3 months of the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, the portion of those LTCH PPS payments that will be based on reasonable cost principles during RY 2008 is negligible relative to LTCH PPS

payments based on the Federal rate, and therefore, we are no longer estimating transition payments as we have done in past impact analyses (for example, 71 FR 27892).

Furthermore, in estimating both RY 2007 and RY 2008 LTCH PPS payments, we did not apply a transition period BN offset to payments to account for the effect of the 5-year transition methodology and election of payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate on Medicare program payments (established in the August 30, 2002 final rule (67 FR 56034)). This is because, for RY 2007, we established a 0.0 percent BN offset (a BN factor of 1.0) to payments to account for the effect of the 5-year transition methodology and election of payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate on Medicare program payments in RY 2007 (71 FR 27841). As noted above and discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.5. of this final rule, we are not proposing a transition period BN offset to all LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008 to account for the estimated cost of the transition period methodology (including the option to elect payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate) in RY 2008 since we are projecting that such costs would be negligible.

As noted in Table 11, we show the impact as if all LTCHs would be paid 100 percent of the Federal rate since, based on the most recent available data and the transition blend percentages set forth at § 412.533(a), nearly all LTCH PPS payments would be based on 100 percent of the applicable LTCH PPS standard Federal rate during the majority of RYs 2007 and 2008. Table 11 illustrates the estimated aggregate impact of the LTCH PPS among various classifications of LTCHs.

- The first column, LTCH Classification, identifies the type of LTCH.
- The second column lists the number of LTCHs of each classification type.
- The third column identifies the number of LTCH cases.
- The fourth column shows the estimated payment per discharge for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year.
- The fifth column shows the estimated payment per discharge for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year.
- The sixth column shows the estimated percentage change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for changes to the Federal rate.
- The seventh column shows the percentage change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for changes to the area wage adjustment at § 412.525(c) (as discussed in section IV.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule).
- The eighth column shows the percent change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for the revision of the SSO policy at § 412.529.
- The ninth column shows the estimated percentage change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for all changes.

TABLE 11: PROJECTED IMPACT OF PAYMENT RATE AND PAYMENT RATE POLICY CHANGES TO LTCH PPS PAYMENTS FOR RY 2008*

[Estimated 2007 LTCH PPS Rate Year Payments Compared to Estimated 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year Payments*]

LTCH Classification	Number of LTCHs	Number of LTCH PPS cases	Average RY 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payment per case [1]	Average RY 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payment per case [2]	Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the Federal rate [3]	Percent change [3] in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the area wage adjustment [4]	Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the SSO policy [5]	Percent change in payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RV 2008 for all changes [6]
ALL PROVIDERS	377	129,812	32,948.31	31,690.36	0.6	−1	−0.9	−3.8
By Location:								
RURAL	23	5,300	26,996.15	25,311.01	0.7	−2.8	−0.9	−6.2
URBAN	354	124,512	33,201.67	31,961.90	0.6	−1	−0.9	−3.7
LARGE	182	75,064	34,569.39	33,479.26	0.6	−0.6	−0.9	−3.2
OTHER	172	49,448	31,125.41	29,658.50	0.6	−1.7	−0.9	−4.7
By Participation Date:								
BEFORE OCT. 1983	16	6,989	28,710.08	27,984.35	0.6	−0.4	−0.6	−2.5
OCT. 1983–SEPT. 1993	44	20,751	34,144.47	32,974.16	0.6	−0.8	−0.9	−3.4
OCT. 1993–SEPT. 2002	203	73,460	32,799.56	31,565.05	0.6	−1	−0.8	−3.8
AFTER OCTOBER 2002	108	27,949	33,576.33	32,052.78	0.6	−1.5	−1.1	−4.5
UNKNOWN PARTICIPATION DATE	6	663	30,193.71	29,182.43	0.6	−0.7	−0.7	−3.3
By Ownership Type:								
VOLUNTARY	83	25,732	32,158.56	30,868.01	0.6	−1.2	−1	−4
PROPRIETARY	254	97,294	33,085.40	31,855.57	0.6	−1	−0.9	−3.7
GOVERNMENT	14	2,694	36,386.88	34,739.92	0.6	−1.8	−0.9	4.5
UNKNOWN OWNERSHIP TYPE	23	4,027	32,383.98	30,918.43	0.6	−1.4	−1	−4.5
By Census Region:								
NEW ENGLAND	16	9,634	27,868.81	27,195.59	0.6	−0.3	−0.7	−2.4

TABLE 11: PROJECTED IMPACT OF PAYMENT RATE AND PAYMENT RATE POLICY CHANGES TO LTCH PPS PAYMENTS FOR RY 2008*—Continued

[Estimated 2007 LTCH PPS Rate Year Payments Compared to Estimated 2008 LTCH PPS Rate Year Payments*]

LTCH Classification	Number of LTCHs	Number of LTCH PPS cases	Average RY 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payment per case [1]	Average RY 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payment per case [2]	Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the Federal rate [3]	Percent change [3] in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the area wage adjustment [4]	Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008 for finalized changes to the SSO policy [5]	Percent change in payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RV 2008 for all changes [6]
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	30	8,114	33,633.19	32,342.46	0.6	−1.1	−0.9	−3.8
SOUTH ATLANTIC	47	13,402	36,618.12	35,064.93	0.6	−1.5	−1	−4.2
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	69	19,477	35,727.90	34,565.61	0.6	−0.5	−0.9	−3.3
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	28	7,848	33,523.34	31,749.31	0.6	−2.3	−1	−5.3
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	18	5,337	35,460.12	33,952.08	0.6	−1.4	−0.9	−4.3
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	129	50,983	29,548.10	28,136.94	0.6	−1.7	−0.9	−4.8
MOUNTAIN	22	5,768	35,112.45	34,384.29	0.6	0.6	−1.1	−2.1
PACIFIC	18	9,249	41,923.26	41,407.75	0.6	0.8	−0.7	−1.2
By Bed Size:								
BEDS: 0–24	32	4,998	30,256.35	28,833.57	0.7	−1.4	−0.9	−4.7
BEDS: 25–49	196	45,487	33,211.07	31,783.23	0.6	−1.4	−1	−4.3
BEDS: 50–74	65	24,371	33,228.43	31,986.77	0.6	−0.9	−0.9	−3.7
BEDS: 75–124	48	22,364	33,612.00	32,369.11	0.6	−1	−0.8	−3.7
BEDS: 125–199	21	17,716	33,261.36	32,056.82	0.6	−0.9	−0.9	−3.6
BEDS: 200 +	15	14,876	31,219.79	30,423.78	0.6	−0.2	−0.7	−2.5
UNKNOWN BED SIZE	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0

*We also note that, as discussed above in section XV.B.4. of this regulatory impact analysis, the 2.2 percent decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments due to the expansion of the special payment provision for co-located LTCHs to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs (as discussed in section V.B. of this final rule) is not reflected in this impact table. However, the impact of the expansion of the ''25 percent'' policy is discussed in greater detail below in section XV.C.1. of this regulatory impact analysis.

[1] Estimated average estimated payment per case for the 12-month period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

[2] Estimated average estimated payment per case for the 12-month period of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

[3] Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for the changes to the Federal rate. (Note, as discussed in section XV.B.4. of this regulatory impact analysis, because about 34 percent of all LTCH cases are projected to receive a payment under the existing SSO policy that is based either on the estimated cost of the case or the ''IPPS comparable amount'' (rather than the Federal rate), the percent change in estimated payments per discharge due to the changes to the Federal rate for most of the categories of LTCHs, 0.6 percent, is slightly less than the update to the Federal rate of 0.71 percent.)

[4] Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for changes to the area wage adjustment policy at § 412.525(c) (as discussed in section V.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule).

[5] Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for the revision of the existing SSO policy at § 412.529 (presented in section V.A.1.a. of the preamble of this final rule).

[6] Percent change in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (as established in the RY 2007 LTCH PPS final rule (71 FR 27798 through 27939)) to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (as discussed in the preamble of this final rule) for all of the payment rate and policy provisions presented in the preamble of this final rule. Note, this column, which shows the percent change in estimated payments per discharge for all changes, may not exactly equal the sum of the percent changes in estimated payments per discharge for changes to the Federal rate (column 7), for area wage adjustment changes (column 8) and the approach discussed for the SSO policy (column 9) due to the effect of estimated changes in aggregate HCO payments, as well as other interactive effects that cannot be isolated.

4. Results

Based on the most recent available data (as described previously for 377 LTCHs), we have prepared the following summary of the impact (as shown in Table 11) of the LTCH PPS payment rate and payment rate policy changes presented in this final rule. (As noted above, the impact of other policy changes presented in this final rule, which do not directly affect the LTCH PPS per discharge payment rate, such as the expansion of the existing payment provision for co-located LTCHs to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs, are not included as part of the impact analysis shown in Table 11. However, the impact of those other policies are discussed separately in section XV.C. of this regulatory impact analysis.)

The impact analysis in Table 11 shows that estimated payments per discharge are expected to decrease approximately 3.8 percent, on average, for all LTCHs from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year as compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year as a result of the payment rate and policy changes presented in this final rule. We note that although we are proposing a 0.71 percent increase to the Federal rate for RY 2008, the impact analysis shown in Table 11 (column 6), only shows a 0.6 percent increase in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 to RY 2008, for most categories of LTCHs, as a result of the changes to the Federal rate. The reason that this

column shows an estimated 0.6 percent increase rather than an estimated 0.7 percent increase (based on the 0.71 percent update to the Federal rate) is because about 34 percent of all LTCH cases are projected to receive a payment under the existing SSO policy. Under either the existing SSO policy or revision of the SSO policy discussed in section V.A.2. of this final rule, the majority of SSO cases would receive an adjusted LTCH PPS payment in RY 2008 that would be based either on the estimated cost of the case or the ''IPPS comparable amount'' (that is, either under the ''blend amount'' at existing § 412.529(c)(2)(iv) or the amount discussed in our approach to address our concerns with the existing SSO policy) rather than a LTCH PPS payment based on the Federal rate. Therefore, because over 30 percent of *all* LTCH PPS cases would receive a payment that is not based on the Federal rate, the percent change in estimated payments per discharge due to the changes to the Federal rate for most categories of LTCHs shown in Table 11 is projected to be slightly less (0.6 percent) than the 0.71 percent update to the Federal rate. Furthermore, although we are proposing a 0.71 percent increase to the Federal rate for RY 2008, the projected percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year shown in Table 11 is due to changes to the area wage adjustment (discussed in section IV.D.1. of this final rule), in conjunction with the revision of the SSO policy (discussed in section V.A.2. of this final rule) and the increase to the HCO fixed-loss amount (as discussed in section IV.D.3.c. of this final rule).

Specifically, as we discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.1. of the preamble of this final rule, we are updating the wage index values for RY 2008 in accordance with the progression of the 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment. We are also increasing the labor-related share from 75.665 percent to 75.788 percent under the LTCH PPS beginning in RY 2008. Because this change to the labor-related share would increase the portion of the Federal rate that is adjusted by the wage index to account for differences in local cost variation (in accordance with § 412.525(c)), LTCHs located in areas with a RY 2008 wage index value that is greater than 1.0 would experience an increase in estimated payments per discharge as a result of the increase in the labor-related share. Conversely, LTCHs located in areas with a RY 2008 wage index value that is less than 1.0 are expected to experience a decrease in estimated payments per discharge as a result of the increase in the labor-related share since a larger portion of the Federal rate would be adjusted by the wage index to account for differences in local cost variation (in accordance with § 412.525(c)). However, the effect of the progression of the 5-year phase-in of the wage index adjustment results in a relatively more significant decrease in estimated payments for LTCHs located in areas with a RY 2008 wage index value that is less than 1.0, than the effect on payments due to the increase in the labor-related share. Consequently, the changes to the wage index adjustment presented in this final rule for LTCHs located in areas with a RY 2008 wage index value that is less than 1.0 are expected to also contribute to the projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge from RY 2007 as compared to RY 2008.

In addition, under the revision to the SSO policy, those LTCH SSO cases with a covered LOS that is less than or equal to the IPPS ALOS plus one standard deviation for the same DRG would receive a lower adjusted LTCH PPS payment than under the current SSO policy. We believe that the LTCH cases meeting the criteria stated above are similar to the same type of cases treated in an acute care hospital and paid for under the IPPS since one standard deviation is a statistical test which measures the certainty of the average of a set of measurements for the purpose of this data analysis. Accordingly, we believe the revision of the SSO policy is appropriate, given that many of these SSO cases that are ''similar to IPPS cases'' most likely do not receive a full course of a LTCH-level of treatment in such a short period of time since, in general, LTCHs are intended to treat longer stay patients. Furthermore, since by far the majority of SSO cases were admitted to the LTCH directly from an acute-care hospital, they are likely to still be in need of acute-level care at the time of admission to the LTCH. We believe that this may indicate that the LTCH admission is a premature and inappropriate discharge from the acute-care hospital and an inappropriate admission to the LTCH. We believe that the revision of the SSO policy will result in appropriate payments for short-stay cases treated at LTCHs as discussed in greater detail in section V.A.2. of this final rule.

Furthermore, as we discussed in greater detail in section IV.D.3.c. of the preamble of this final rule, given the regulatory requirement at § 412.525(a) that estimated outlier payments not exceed 8 percent of estimated total LTCH PPS payments, this decrease in estimated LTCH PPS payments for RY 2008 resulting primarily from the changes to the SSO policy and the changes to the area wage adjustment would require an increase in the HCO fixed-loss amount to maintain estimated outlier payments of no more than 8 percent of the estimated total LTCH PPS payments (resulting from the payment rate and policy changes presented in this rule). Thus, the increase in the outlier fixed-loss amount also contributes to the projected decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year. For example, many LTCHs are expected to receive a decrease in HCO payments. As a result of the increase to the fixed-loss amount from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year ($14,887) to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year ($22,954), fewer cases would qualify as outlier cases (that is, the estimated cost of the case exceeds the outlier threshold). Since many LTCHs are expected to receive fewer outlier payments, total estimated payments per discharge are expected to decrease from RY 2007 to RY 2008.

a. Location

Based on the most recent available data, the majority of LTCHs are in urban areas. Approximately 6 percent of the LTCHs are identified as being located in a rural area, and approximately 4 percent of all LTCH cases are treated in these rural hospitals. The impact analysis presented in Table 11 shows that the percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge for the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for rural LTCHs would be 6.2 percent for all changes, and would be 3.7 percent for urban LTCHs for all changes.

The projected percent decrease in estimated payments to rural LTCHs is greater than that for urban LTCHs because rural LTCHs are expected to experience a larger decrease in estimated payments due to the changes to the area wage adjustment because the wage index for all rural LTCHs is less than 1.0, as explained above in this section. Furthermore, the wage indices of all 23 rural LTCHs in our database have decreased from RY 2007 to RY 2008.

Large urban LTCHs are projected to experience a 3.2 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, while other urban LTCHs are projected to experience a 4.7 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared

to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, as shown in Table 11. Other urban LTCHs are projected to experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge because of the changes to the area wage adjustment. This is because the majority of other urban LTCHs (over 90 percent) are located in urban areas that have a wage index value of less than 1.0, and therefore, would experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge as a result of the changes to the wage index adjustment, as explained above.

Large urban LTCHs are projected to experience a lower than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge for all changes because of the changes to the area wage adjustment because the majority of large urban LTCHs are located in urban areas that have a wage index value of greater than 1.0, as explained above in this section.

Additionally, all rural and both large and other urban hospitals are projected to experience a lower than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge for all changes because of the increased HCO fixed-loss amount as discussed previously.

b. Participation Date

LTCHs are grouped by participation date into four categories: (1) Before October 1983; (2) between October 1983 and September 1993; (3) between October 1993 and September 2002; and (4) after October 2002. Based on the most recent available data, the majority (approximately 54 percent) of the LTCH cases are in hospitals that began participating between October 1993 and September 2002, and are projected to experience a 3.8 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, as shown in Table 11.

Approximately 12 percent of LTCH PPS cases are in LTCHs that began participating in Medicare between October 1983 and September 1993, and those LTCHs are projected to experience a 3.4 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year, as shown in Table 11. We are projecting that LTCHs that began participating in Medicare between October 1983 and September 1993 would experience a lower than average decrease in estimated payments for RY 2008 primarily because we are projecting that these LTCHs are expected to experience a lower than average decrease (0.8 percent) in estimated payments per discharge due to the changes to the area wage adjustment. This is because many of the LTCHs that began participating in Medicare between October 1983 and September 1993 are located in areas where the RY 2008 wage index value would be greater than the RY 2007 wage index value, and because several of these LTCHs are located in areas that have a wage index value of greater than 1.0, (as explained above).

LTCHs that began participating before October 1983 are projected to experience a 2.5 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (see Table 11). We are projecting that LTCHs that began participating in Medicare before October 1983 would experience a decrease in estimated payments for RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007 primarily because we are projecting that LTCHs in this participation date category would experience a decrease in estimated payments in RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007 due to the changes to the fixed-loss amount. In addition, LTCHs that began participating in Medicare before October 1983 are expected to experience a lower than average decrease in estimated payments due to the revision of the SSO policy.

Approximately 29 percent of LTCHs began participating in Medicare after October 2002 (that is, the beginning of the LTCH PPS, which was implemented for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002), and those LTCHs are projected to experience a 4.5 percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year compared to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year (see Table 11). We are projecting that LTCHs that began participating in Medicare after October 2002 will experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments for RY 2008 primarily because we are projecting that these LTCHs would experience a larger than average decrease (1.5 percent) in estimated payments per discharge due to the changes to the area wage adjustment. This is because the majority of the LTCHs that began participating in Medicare after October 2002 are located in areas where the RY 2008 wage index value would be less than the RY 2007 wage index value, and because the majority (over 96 percent) of these LTCHs are located in areas that would have a RY 2008 wage index value of less than 1.0, (as discussed above in this section).

c. Ownership Control

Other than LTCHs whose ownership control type is unknown, LTCHs are grouped into three categories based on ownership control type: voluntary; proprietary; and government. Based on the most recent available data, approximately 4 percent of LTCHs are identified as government-owned and operated. We expect that for these government-owned and operated LTCHs, estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments per discharge would decrease 4.5 percent in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year, as shown in Table 11. We are projecting that government-run LTCHs would experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments in RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007 due to the effect of the changes to the area wage adjustment. This is because all but 3 of the 13 government-run LTCHs in our database are located in areas where the wage index value for RY 2008 is less than 1.0, as explained above.

Similarly, we project that estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments per discharge for voluntary LTCHs, which account for approximately 22 percent of LTCHs, would decrease 4 percent in comparison to estimated 2007 LTCH PPS rate year payments (see Table 11). We are projecting that voluntary LTCHs would experience a slightly higher than average decrease in estimated payments in RY 2008 as compared to RY 2007 due to the changes to the wage index adjustment since over 60 percent (51 LTCHs) of the voluntary LTCHs are located in areas where the wage index value is less than 1.0 (as discussed above).

The majority (approximately 67 percent) of LTCHs are identified as proprietary. We project that 2008 LTCH PPS rate year estimated payments per discharge for these proprietary LTCHs would decrease 3.7 percent in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (see Table 11).

d. Census Region

Estimated payments per discharge for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year are projected to decrease for LTCHs located in all regions in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year although five out of the nine regions are projected to have a lower than average or average decrease in payments as compared to the average decrease for all providers. The percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for most regions is largely attributable to the increase in the HCO fixed-loss amount (as explained above).

Of the 9 census regions, we project that the decrease in 2008 LTCH PPS rate year estimated payments per discharge in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year would have the largest impact

on LTCHs in the East South Central and West South Central regions (5.3 percent and 4.8 percent, respectively; see Table 11). LTCHs located in both the East South Central and West South Central regions are expected to experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments due to the changes in the area wage adjustment (2.3 percent for the East South Central region, and 1.7 percent for the West South Central region, as shown in Table 11). This is because over 80 percent of all LTCHs located in the East South Central region and the West South Central regions are located in areas with a wage index value that is less than 1.0 (as described above). In addition, these LTCHs are also expected to experience a higher than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge due to the revision of the SSO policy since many of the LTCHs in these two regions have a larger than average percentage of SSO cases (based on FY 2006 LTCH claims data).

e. Bed Size

LTCHs were grouped into seven categories based on bed size: 0–24 beds; 25–49 beds; 50–74 beds; 75–124 beds; 125–199 beds; greater than 200 beds; and unknown bed size.

We are projecting a decrease in estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments per discharge in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year for all bed size categories. As noted above, the projected percent decrease in estimated payments per discharge from the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year to the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year is largely attributable to the changes in the area wage adjustment, and the increase in the outlier fixed-loss amount (as explained above).

Of the six different bed size categories, the two categories with the lowest bed count (0–24 beds and 25–49 beds) are projected to have higher than average decreases in payment. Estimated payments per discharge for the 2008 LTCH PPS rate year for LTCHs with 0–24 beds are projected to decrease the most in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (4.7 percent; see Table 11), followed by LTCHs with 25–49 beds (4.3 percent; see Table 11). This higher than average decrease in estimated payments per discharge for LTCHs with less than 49 beds (that is, LTCHs in the 0–24 bed size category and LTCHs in the 25–49 bed size category) is largely due to the changes to the area wage adjustment and the increase in the HCO fixed-loss amount (as explained above). Specifically, the majority of LTCHs with 49 beds or less are located in areas where the RY 2008 wage index value is less than the RY 2007 wage index value. In addition, the majority (over 84 percent) of LTCHs with 49 beds or less are located in areas where the RY 2008 wage index is less than 1.0. We project that LTCHs with greater than 200 beds would have a less than average decrease in estimated 2008 LTCH PPS rate year payments per discharge in comparison to the 2007 LTCH PPS rate year (2.5 percent; see Table 11). This smaller decrease in estimated payments per discharge for LTCHs with greater than 200 beds is primarily due to the changes to the area wage adjustment. This is because the majority of these LTCHs are located in areas where the RY 2008 wage index value is greater than the RY 2007 wage index value, and because 12 of the 13 LTCHs with greater than 200 beds are located in an area where the RY 2008 wage index value is greater than 1.0 (as described above).

5. Effect on the Medicare Program

Based on actuarial projections, an estimate of Medicare spending (total estimated Medicare program payments) for LTCH services over the next 5 years based on current LTCH PPS policy (as established in previous LTCH PPS final rules) is shown in Table 4 in section IV.D.5. of the preamble of this final rule. As noted, we project that the provisions of this final rule, would result in a decrease in estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments in RY 2008 of about $156 million (or about 3.8 percent) for the 377 LTCHs in our database, as explained in greater detail above in section XV.A. of this regulatory impact analysis.

Consistent with the statutory requirement for BN, as we discussed in the August 30, 2002 final rule that implemented the LTCH PPS, in developing the LTCH PPS, we intended that estimated aggregate payments under the LTCH PPS in FY 2003 be projected to equal the estimated aggregate payments that would have been made if the LTCH PPS were not implemented. Our methodology for estimating payments for purposes of the BN calculations for determining the FY 2003 standard Federal rate uses the best available data and necessarily reflects assumptions. As we collect data from LTCHs, we will monitor payments and evaluate the ultimate accuracy of the assumptions used in the BN calculations (that is, inflation factors, intensity of services provided, or behavioral response to the implementation of the LTCH PPS). As discussed in section IV.D.6. of this final rule, we still do not have sufficient new cost report and claims data generated under the LTCH PPS to enable us to conduct a comprehensive reevaluation of our FY 2003 BN calculation at this time.

Section 123 of the BBRA and section 307 of the BIPA provide the Secretary with extremely broad authority in developing the LTCH PPS, including the authority for appropriate adjustments. In accordance with this broad authority, we may discuss in a future proposed rule a possible one-time prospective adjustment to the LTCH PPS rates under § 412.523(d)(3) on or before July 1, 2008, so that the effect of any significant differences between actual payments and estimated payments for the first year of the LTCH PPS is not perpetuated in the LTCH PPS payment rates for future years.

6. Effect on Medicare Beneficiaries

Under the LTCH PPS, hospitals receive payment based on the average resources consumed by patients for each diagnosis. We do not expect any changes in the quality of care or access to services for Medicare beneficiaries under the LTCH PPS, but we expect that paying prospectively for LTCH services would enhance the efficiency of the Medicare program.

C. Impact of Other Policy Changes

1. Effects of Policy Expansion of the Special Payment Provisions for LTCH HwHs and LTCH Satellites to Certain Situations Not Presently Covered by Existing § 412.534 for Subclause (I) LTCHs

In section V.B. of the preamble to this final rule, we have revised § 412.534 and added § 412.536 to extend the existing payment provision for co-located LTCHs (HwHs and satellites of LTCHs) to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs. Under the existing policy, which was finalized for FY 2005, a payment adjustment is applied to those discharges from co-located LTCHs that were admitted from host hospitals that are in excess of a specified threshold unless those patients had reached HCO status at the referring hospital. Following a 4-year phase-in of this payment adjustment, for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2008, the threshold is 25 percent or an applicable percentage established under the regulation that takes into account the particular circumstances of rural, urban single, or MSA dominant hospitals. Specifically, at existing § 412.534, we have provided that under the LTCH PPS, Medicare will pay the lesser of an amount otherwise payable under subpart O of 42 CFR part 412 or a LTCH PPS payment amount

equivalent to what would have been paid under the IPPS for those discharges that were not HCOs from the referring hospital and that exceed 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) of the LTCH or LTCH satellite's Medicare discharges for any cost reporting period (69 FR 49191 through 49213). We originally established this payment adjustment because our data suggested that in many cases, hospitals were prematurely shifting patients to co-located LTCHs, and therefore, that we were generating a Medicare payment to the first hospital (generally an acute care hospital paid under the IPPS) and also an additional Medicare payment under the LTCH PPS to an LTCH for what was, in essence, one episode of care. Consequently, we believed that in such circumstances co-located LTCHs were functioning as step-down units of their host hospitals, a configuration which is not permitted under section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Act, which provides for the establishment of rehabilitation and psychiatric units of acute care hospitals but does not allow LTCH units.

As detailed in section V.B. of the preamble of this final rule, our data suggests that many of our concerns regarding patient shifting between co-located providers also pertain to those LTCHs that are not co-located with other hospitals. The RY 2005 LTCH discharges from the MedPAR files indicate that about 73 percent of the then 200 free-standing LTCHs admitted 25 percent or less of their Medicare discharges from an individual acute care hospital; for 82 of those freestanding LTCHs, the percentage was between 25 and 50 percent; for 33 of the freestanding LTCHs, it was between 50 and 75 percent. For 6 percent of those free-standing LTCHs, it was between 75 and 100 percent of their Medicare discharges were admitted from one acute care hospital. In addition, the RY 2005 LTCH discharges from the MedPAR files indicate that for over 63 percent of all LTCHs, more than 25 percent of their discharges are for patients admitted from an individual acute care hospital. Based on this data, as discussed in section V.B. of this final rule, we have decided to expand this above described payment adjustment at existing § 412.534 to apply equally to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 for subclause (I) LTCHs beginning with cost reporting periods starting in RY 2008. Under this policy, if any subclause (I) LTCH's or satellite facility's discharges that had been admitted from *any* referring hospital that is not co-located with the LTCH or LTCH satellite (under § 412.536) or from a co-located host (under the revision to § 412.534) exceed 25 percent (or the applicable percentage) for the LTCH's cost reporting period, an adjusted payment would be made at the lesser of the otherwise payable amount under the LTCH PPS or the LTCH PPS payment amount that would be equivalent to what Medicare would otherwise pay under the IPPS. Grandfathered LTCH HwHs and LTCH satellites will also be subject to the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold payment adjustment for Medicare discharges admitted from their co-located host, under § 412.534(g) and will additionally be governed by § 412.536 for discharges admitted from non-co-located referring hospitals.

It is our intent that the revisions that we are finalizing would discourage inappropriate patient shifting to LTCHs before the referring hospital delivers a full episode of patient care. To the extent that LTCHs change their behaviors because this policy reduces the financial incentives for certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 to admit patients prematurely discharged from other hospitals, we believe that there would be savings to the Medicare program. Specifically, as under the existing policy for co-located LTCHs at existing § 412.534, the payment adjustment would not apply to either those subclause (I) LTCH discharges admitted from referring hospitals not co-located with the LTCH or LTCH satellite (under § 412.536) or those subclause (I)LTCH HwH or satellite discharges admitted from co-located host hospitals (under the revision to § 412.534) that have already reached HCO status.

At this time, based on the most recent LTCH claims data available and assuming no change in LTCH behavior if this policy were implemented, we estimate that the extension of the 25 percent (or applicable percentage) threshold at existing § 412.534 to certain situations not presently covered by existing § 412.534 subclause (I) LTCHs would not result in savings to the Medicare program in RY 2008 due to our adoption of a 3 year transition to this policy. However, as that policy is fully implemented at 25 percent (or the applicable level) there will be a significant impact in LTCH payments. As discussed above in this section, we believe that this policy would discourage inappropriate patient shifting to LTCHs before the non-co-located referring hospital or co-located host delivered a full episode of patient care and because we believe that this policy would result in appropriate Medicare payments under the LTCH PPS, and therefore, to the extent that LTCHs alter their admission protocols, we do not believe that there would be an adverse financial impact on LTCHs, nor would there be an adverse impact on Medicare beneficiary's access to care.

2. Effects of Policy Change Relating to Payment for Direct Graduate Medical Education (GME)

In section XII. of the preamble of this final rule, with respect to the rules that hospitals must meet to count residents training in nonhospital settings for indirect medical education (IME) and direct GME payment purposes, we finalized our proposal to revise § 413.75(b) revising the definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting.'' We also finalized our proposal to revise § 412.105(f)(1)(ii)(C) for IME and add § 413.78(f) to reflect the revised definition of ''all or substantially all.'' The revised definition is effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007 and states that ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' means at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to direct GME. This differs from the prior definition of ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting,'' which required that, to count FTE residents training in a nonhospital setting, a hospital was required to pay for 100 percent of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits, as well as the portion of the actual cost of the teaching physician's salary and fringe benefits attributable to direct GME activities at the nonhospital site. In addition, under the revised definition of ''all or substantially all'' of the costs, in response to hospitals' concerns regarding the difficulty of obtaining actual salary data from teaching physicians to document the actual cost of the teaching physicians' time spent on GME activities, we are finalizing our proposal to allow hospitals to use certain proxy information, such as national average physician compensation amounts, to calculate the cost of the teaching physicians' time spent in GME activities at the nonhospital site.

We believe that much of the administrative burden on hospitals related to calculating and documenting the amount they need to pay for ''all or substantially all'' of the costs of residency training at the nonhospital

site will be significantly reduced, if not eliminated, under our final rule. Had we not made the changes and continued to require that hospitals provide extensive documentation that they are paying for the costs of the training program in the nonhospital setting, we understand the industry had expressed concern that hospitals may significantly reduce the amount of training occurring in nonhospital settings and caused residency training to be transferred to hospitals. We further note that the Congress intended to encourage the shift of training to nonhospital settings and we believe this policy change can facilitate further shifts to nonhospital settings. Since we are *not* finalizing a change that will impact the aggregate amount of residency training that will occur, and Medicare will continue to pay for residency training occurring in hospitals, overall Medicare payments for residency training as a result of this finalized policy will remain constant.

D. Accounting Statement

As discussed in section XV.A.1. of this regulatory impact analysis, the impact analysis of this final rule results in a decrease in estimated aggregate payments of $156 million (or about 3.8 percent) for the 377 LTCHs in our database. Therefore, as required by OMB Circular A–4 (available at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a004/a-4.pdf*), in Table 12, we have prepared an accounting statement showing the classification of the expenditures associated with the provisions of this final rule. Table 12 provides our best estimate of the decrease in Medicare payments under the LTCH PPS as a result of the provisions presented in this final rule based on the data for the 377 LTCHs in our database. All expenditures are classified as transfers to Medicare providers (that is, LTCHs).

TABLE 12.—ACCOUNTING STATEMENT: CLASSIFICATION OF ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES, FROM THE 2007 LTCH PPS RATE YEAR TO THE 2008 LTCH PPS RATE YEAR

[In Millions]

Category	Transfers
Annualized Monetized Transfers.	Negative transfer—estimated decrease in expenditures: $156.
From Whom To Whom?	Federal Government to LTCH Medicare Providers.

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12866, this final rule was reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

List of Subjects

42 CFR Part 412

Administrative practice and procedure, Health facilities, Medicare, Puerto Rico, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

42 CFR Part 413

Health facilities, Kidney diseases, Medicare, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services amends 42 CFR chapter IV as set forth below:

PART 412—PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEMS FOR INPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 412 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 1102 and 1871 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1302 and 1395hh) and section 124 of Pub. L. 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–332).

Subpart B—Hospital Services Subject to and Excluded From the Prospective Payment Systems for Inpatient Operating Costs and Inpatient Capital-Related Costs

■ 2. Section 412.22 is amended by adding paragraphs (h)(3)(i) and (ii) to read as follows:

§ 412.22 Excluded hospitals and hospital units: General rules.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(3) * * *

(i) Any hospital structured as a satellite facility on September 30, 1999, and excluded from the prospective payment systems on that date, to the extent the hospital continues operating under the same terms and conditions, including the number of beds and square footage considered, for the purposes of Medicare participation and payment, to be part of the hospital, in effect on September 30, 1999; or

(ii) Any hospital excluded from the prospective payment systems under § 412.23(e)(2)(ii).

* * * * *

Subpart G—Special Treatment of Certain Facilities Under the Prospective Payment System for Inpatient Operating Costs

■ 3. Section 412.105 is amended by revising paragraph (f)(1)(ii)(C) to read as follows:

§ 412.105 Special treatment: Hospitals that incur indirect costs for graduate medical education programs.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(1) * * *

(ii) * * *

(C) Effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1997, the time spent by a resident in a nonhospital setting in patient care activities, as defined in § 413.75(b) of this subchapter, under an approved medical residency training program is counted towards the determination of full-time equivalency if the criteria set forth in § 413.78(c), (d), (e), or (f) of this subchapter, as applicable, are met.

* * * * *

Subpart O—Prospective Payment System for Long-Term Care Hospitals

■ 4. Section 412.517 is amended by—

■ A. Redesignating the introductory text and paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) as paragraphs (a) introductory text, (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(4), respectively.

■ B. Adding new paragraph (b).

The addition reads as follows:

§ 412.517 Revision of LTC–DRG group classifications and weighting factors.

* * * * *

(b) Beginning in FY 2008, the annual changes to the LTC–DRG classifications and recalibration of the weighting factors described in paragraph (a) of this section are made in a budget neutral manner such that estimated aggregate LTCH PPS payments are not affected.

■ 5. Section 412.523 is amended by adding new paragraph (c)(3)(iv) to read as follows:

§ 412.523 Methodology for calculating the Federal prospective payment rates.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) * * *

(iv) *For long-term care hospital prospective payment system rate year beginning July 1, 2007 and ending June 30, 2008.* The standard Federal rate for long-term care hospital prospective payment system rate year beginning July 1, 2007 and ending June 30, 2008 is the standard Federal rate for the previous long-term care hospital prospective payment system rate year updated by 0.71 percent. The standard Federal rate is adjusted, as appropriate, as described in paragraph (d) of this section.

* * * * *

■ 6. Section 412.529 is amended by—

■ A. Revising paragraph (a).

■ B. Revising the introductory text for paragraph (c)(2).

■ C. Redesignating paragraph (c)(3) as paragraph (c)(4).

■ D. Adding new paragraph (c)(3).

The revision and addition reads as follows:

§ 412.529 Special payment provision for short-stay outliers.

(a) *Short-stay outlier defined.* ''Short-stay outlier'' means a discharge with a covered length of stay in a long-term care hospital that is up to and including five-sixths of the geometric average length of stay for each LTC–DRG.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section, for discharges occurring on or after July 1, 2006, from long-term care hospitals described under § 412.23(e)(2)(i), the LTCH prospective payment system adjusted payment amount for a short-stay outlier case is the least of the following amounts:

(i) * * *

(ii) * * *

(iii) * * *

(iv) * * *

(3) For discharges specified in paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section, occurring on or after July 1, 2007, from long-term care hospitals described under § 412.23(e)(2)(i), the LTCH prospective payment system adjusted payment amount for a short-stay outlier case is adjusted as follows:

(i) If the covered length of stay of the case assigned to a particular LTC–DRG is less than or equal to one standard deviation from the geometric ALOS of the same DRG under the inpatient prospective payment system (the IPPS-comparable threshold), the LTCH prospective payment system adjusted payment amount for such a case is the least of the following amounts:

(A) 120 percent of the LTC–DRG specific per diem amount determined under paragraph (d)(1) of this section;

(B) 100 percent of the estimated cost of the case determined under paragraph (d)(2) of this section;

(C) The Federal prospective payment for the LTC–DRG as determined under paragraph (d)(3) of this section; or

(D) An amount payable under subpart O comparable to the hospital inpatient prospective payment system per diem amount determined under paragraph (d)(4) of this section.

(ii) If the covered length of stay of the case assigned to a particular LTC–DRG is greater than one standard deviation from the geometric ALOS of the same DRG under the inpatient prospective payment system (the IPPS-comparable threshold), the LTCH prospective payment system adjusted payment amount for such a case is determined under paragraph (c)(2) of this section.

* * * * *

■ 7. Section 412.534 is amended by—

■ A. Revising paragraphs (a), (b), (c)(1), (c)(2), (d)(1), and (e)(1).

■ B. Revising the introductory text for paragraph (g).

■ C. Adding paragraph (h).

The revision and addition read as follows:

§ 412.534 Special payment provisions for long-term care hospitals within hospitals and satellites of long-term care hospitals.

(a) *Scope.* Except as provided in paragraph (h), the policies set forth in this section apply to discharges occurring in cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004 from long-term care hospitals as described in § 412.23(e)(2)(i) meeting the criteria in § 412.22(e)(2), or satellite facilities of long-term care hospitals that meet the criteria in § 412.22(h).

(b) *Patients admitted from hospitals not located in the same building or on the same campus as the long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite.* Payments to the long-term care hospital for patients admitted to the long-term care hospital or to a satellite of the long-term care hospital from another hospital that is not the co-located hospital are made under the rules in this subpart with no adjustment under this section. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, payments to the long-term care hospital for discharges of Medicare patients admitted to the LTCH hospital or LTCH satellite facility of the long-term care hospital from another hospital that is not the co-located hospital are subject to the provisions in § 412.536.

(c) * * *

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (g) and (h) of this section, for any cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2004 in which the long-term care hospital or its satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom no more than 25 percent were admitted to the hospital or its satellite facility from the co-located hospital, payments are made under the rules at § 412.500 through § 412.541 in this subpart with no adjustment under this section.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (d), (e), (g), or (h) of this section, for any cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2004 in which the long-term care hospital or satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than 25 percent were admitted to the hospital or satellite facility from the co-located hospital, payments for the patients who are admitted from the co-located hospital and who cause the long-term care hospital or satellite facility to exceed the 25 percent threshold for discharged patients who have been admitted from the co-located hospital are the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount payable under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (f) of this section, to the amount that would be determined under the rules at Subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or satellite facility's patients are made under the rules in this subpart at § 412.500 through § 412.541 with no adjustment under this section.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(1) Subject to paragraphs (g) and (h) of this section, in the case of a long-term care hospital or satellite facility that is located in a rural area as defined in § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(C) and is co-located with another hospital for any cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2004 in which the long-term care hospital or satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than 50 percent were admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite facility from the co-located hospital, payments for the patients who are admitted from the co-located hospital and who cause the long-term care hospital or satellite facility to exceed the 50 percent threshold for discharged patients who were admitted from the co-located hospital are the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount payable under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (f) of this section, to the amount that were otherwise payable under subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or satellite facility's patients are made under the rules in this subpart at § 412.500 through § 412.541 with no adjustment under this section.

* * * * *

(e) *Special treatment of urban single or MSA dominant hospitals.* (1) Subject to paragraphs (g) and (h) of this section, in the case of a long-term care hospital or satellite facility that is co-located with the only other hospital in the MSA or with a MSA dominant hospital as defined in paragraph (e)(4) of this section, for any cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2004 in which the long-term care hospital or satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than the percentage calculated under paragraph (e)(2) of this section

were admitted to the hospital from the co-located hospital, payments for the patients who are admitted from the co-located hospital and who cause the long-term care hospital to exceed the applicable threshold for discharged patients who have been admitted from the co-located hospital are the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (f) of this section, to the amount that otherwise would be determined under Subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or satellite facility's patients are made under the rules in this subpart with no adjustment under this section.

* * * * *

(g) *Transition period for long-term care hospitals and satellite facilities paid under this subpart.* Except as specified in paragraph (h)(2), in the case of a long-term care hospital or a satellite facility that is paid under the provisions of this subpart on October 1, 2004 or of a hospital that is paid under the provisions of this subpart and whose qualifying period under § 412.23(e) began on or before October 1, 2004, the amount paid is calculated as specified below:

* * * * *

(h) *Effective date of policies in this section for certain co-located LTCH hospitals and satellites of LTCHs.*

(1) The policies set forth in this section apply to Medicare patient discharges that were admitted from a hospital located in the same building or on the same campus as a long-term care hospital described in § 412.23(e)(2)(i) that meets the criteria in § 412.22(f) and a satellite facility of a long-term care hospital as described at § 412.22(h)(3)(i) for discharges occurring in cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007.

(2) In the case of a long-term care hospital or satellite of a long-term care hospital that is described under paragraph (h)(1), the thresholds applied at (c), (d), and (e) will not be less than the percentages specified below:

(i) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007 and before July 1, 2008, the lesser of 75 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite from its co-located hospital during the cost reporting period or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite from that co-located hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period.

(ii) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2008 and before July 1, 2009, the lesser of 50 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the LTCH or the satellite of an LTCH from its co-located hospital or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted from that co-located hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period.

(iii) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009, 25 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite from its co-located hospital during the cost reporting period.

(3) In determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the co-located hospital under this paragraph, patients on whose behalf a Medicare high cost outlier payment was made at the co-located referring hospital are not counted toward this threshold.

(4) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, payments to long term care hospitals described in § 412.23(e)(2)(i) that meet the criteria in § 412.22(f) and satellite facilities of long-term care hospitals described at § 412.22(h)(3)(i) are subject to the provisions of § 412.536 for discharges of Medicare patients who are admitted from a hospital not located in the same building or on the same campus as the LTCH or LTCH satellite facility.

■ 8. Section 412.536 is added to read as follows:

§ 412.536 Special payment provisions for long-term care hospitals and satellites of long-term care hospitals that discharged Medicare patients admitted from a hospital not located in the same building or on the same campus as the long-term care hospital or satellite of the long-term care hospital.

(a) *Scope.* For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, the policies set forth in this section apply to discharges from long-term care hospitals as described in § 412.23(e)(2)(i) and satellite facilities of long-term care hospitals described in § 412.22(h), including satellite facilities of long-term care hospitals described in (h)(3)(i) but excluding satellite facilities described in (h)(3)(ii).

(b) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, payments for discharges of Medicare patients admitted from a hospital not located in the same building or on the same campus as the long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility will be made under either paragraph (b)(1) or paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (c), (d) and subject to paragraph (f) of this section, for any cost reporting period beginning on or after July 1, 2007 in which a long-term care hospital or a long-term care hospital satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom no more than 25 percent were admitted to the long-term care hospital or the satellite facility from any individual hospital not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite of a long-term care hospital, payments for the Medicare discharges admitted from that hospital are made under the rules at § 412.500 through § 412.541 in this subpart with no adjustment under this section.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (c) and (d) and subject to paragraph (f) of this section, for any cost reporting period beginning on or after July 1, 2007 in which a long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than 25 percent were admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite facility from any individual hospital not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite of a long-term care hospital, payment for the Medicare discharges who cause the long-term care hospital or satellite facility to exceed the 25 percent threshold for discharged patients who have been admitted from that referring hospital is the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount payable under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (e) of this section, to the amount that would be determined under the rules at subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or satellite facility's patients admitted from that referring hospital are made under the rules in this subpart at § 412.500 through § 412.541 with no adjustment under this section.

(3) In determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted to the long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility from any referring hospital not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite of a long-term care hospital, under paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, patients on whose behalf a Medicare high cost outlier payment was made to the referring hospital are not counted towards the 25 percent threshold from that referring hospital.

(c) *Special treatment of rural hospitals.* (1) Subject to paragraph (f) of this section, in the case of a long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility that is located in a rural

area as defined in § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(C) that has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than 50 percent were admitted to the long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility from a hospital not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite of a long-term car hospital, payment for the Medicare discharges who are admitted from that hospital and who cause the long-term care hospital or satellite facility to exceed the 50 percent threshold for Medicare discharges is determined at the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount payable under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (e) of this section, to the amount that is otherwise payable under subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or long-term care hospital satellite facility's Medicare discharges admitted from that referring hospital are made under the rules in this subpart at § 412.500 through § 412.541 with no adjustment under this section.

(2) In determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, patients on whose behalf a Medicare high cost outlier payment was made at the referring hospital are not counted toward the 50 percent threshold.

(d) *Special treatment of urban single or MSA dominant hospitals.* (1) Subject to paragraph (f) of this section, in the case of a long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility that admits Medicare patients from the only other hospital in the MSA or from a referring MSA dominant hospital as defined in paragraph (d)(4) of this section, that are not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite of a long-term care hospital for any cost reporting period beginning on or after July 1, 2007, in which the long-term care hospital or satellite facility has a discharged Medicare inpatient population of whom more than the percentage calculated under paragraph (d)(2) of this section were admitted to the hospital from the single or MSA-dominant referring hospital, payment for the Medicare discharges who are admitted from the referring hospital and who cause the long-term care hospital or long-term care hospital satellite facility to exceed the applicable threshold for Medicare discharges who have been admitted from the referring hospital is the lesser of the amount otherwise payable under this subpart or the amount under this subpart that is equivalent, as set forth in paragraph (e) of this section, to the amount that otherwise would be determined under Subpart A, § 412.1(a). Payments for the remainder of the long-term care hospital's or satellite facility's Medicare discharges admitted from that referring hospital are made under the rules in this subpart at § 412.500 through § 412.541 with no adjustment under this section.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (d)(1) of this section, the percentage threshold is equal to the percentage of total Medicare discharges in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in which the hospital is located that are from the referring hospital, but in no case is less than 25 percent or more than 50 percent.

(3) In determining the percentage of patients admitted from the referring hospital under paragraph (d)(1) of this section, patients on whose behalf a Medicare outlier payment was made at the referring hospital are not counted toward the applicable threshold.

(4) For purposes of this paragraph, an ''MSA-dominant hospital'' is a hospital that has discharged more than 25 percent of the total hospital Medicare discharges in the MSA in which the hospital is located.

(e) *Calculation of adjusted payment*—(1) *Calculation of adjusted long-term care hospital prospective payment system amount.* CMS calculates an amount payable under subpart O equivalent to an amount that would otherwise be paid under the hospital inpatient prospective payment system at Subpart A, § 412.1(a). The amount is based on the sum of the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system operating standardized amount and capital Federal rate in effect at the time of the long-term care hospital discharge.

(2) *Operating inpatient prospective payment system standardized amount.* The hospital inpatient prospective payment system operating standardized amount—

(i) Is adjusted for the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system DRG weighting factors;

(ii) Is adjusted for different area wage levels based on the geographic classifications set forth at § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(A) through (C) and the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system labor-related share, using the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system wage index value for non-reclassified hospitals. For long-term care hospitals located in Alaska and Hawaii, this amount is also adjusted by the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system cost of living adjustment factors;

(iii) Includes, where applicable, adjustments for indirect medical education costs and for the costs of serving a disproportionate share of low-income patients.

(3) *Hospital inpatient prospective payment system capital Federal rate.* The hospital inpatient prospective payment system capital Federal rate—

(i) Is adjusted for the applicable hospital inpatient prospective payment system DRG weighting factors;

(ii) Is adjusted by the applicable geographic adjustment factors, including local cost variation based on the applicable geographic classifications set forth at § 412.64(b)(1)(ii)(A) through (C) and the applicable full hospital inpatient prospective payment system wage index value for non-reclassified hospitals, applicable large urban location and cost of living adjustment factors for long-term care hospitals for Alaska and Hawaii, if applicable;

(iii) Includes, where applicable, capital inpatient prospective payment system adjustments for indirect medical education costs and the costs of serving a disproportionate share of low-income patients.

(4) *High cost outlier.* An additional payment for high cost outlier cases is based on the applicable fixed loss amount established for the hospital inpatient prospective payment system.

(f) *Transition period for long-term care hospitals and satellites paid under this section.* In the case of a long-term care hospital or satellite of a long-term care hospital that is paid under the provisions of this section, the thresholds applied under paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section will not be less than the percentages specified below:

(1) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007 and before July 1, 2008, the lesser of 75 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite facility of a long-term care hospital from all referring hospitals not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite facility of a long-term care hospital during the cost reporting period or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted to the long-term care hospital or satellite of a long-term care hospital from that referring hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period.

(2) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2008 and before July 1, 2009, the lesser of 50 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the long-term care hospital or to the satellite facility of a long-term care hospital from

all referring hospitals not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite facility of a long-term care hospital during the cost reporting period or the percentage of Medicare discharges that had been admitted from that referring hospital during the long-term care hospital's or satellite's RY 2005 cost reporting period.

(3) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2009, 25 percent of the total number of Medicare discharges that were admitted to the long-term care hospital or to the satellite facility of a long-term care hospital from all referring hospitals not co-located with the long-term care hospital or with the satellite facility of a long-term care hospital to the long-term care hospital during the cost reporting period.

(4) In determining the percentage of Medicare discharges admitted from the referring hospital under this paragraph, patients on whose behalf a Medicare high cost outlier payment was made at the referring hospital are not counted toward this threshold.

PART 413—PRINCIPLES OF REASONABLE COST REIMBURSEMENT; PAYMENT FOR END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE SERVICES; PROSPECTIVELY DETERMINED PAYMENT RATES FOR SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES

■ 9. The authority citation for part 413 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 1102, 1812(d), 1814(b), 1815, 1833(a), (i), and (n), 1861(v), 1871, 1881, 1883, and 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1302, 1395d(d), 1395f(b), 1395g, 1395l(a), (i), and (n), 1395x(v), 1395hh, 1395rr, 1395tt, and 1395ww); and sec. 124 of Pub. L. 106–133 (113 Stat. 1501A–332).

Subpart F—Specific Categories of Costs

■ 10. Section 413.75(b) is amended by revising the definition ''all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting'' to read as follows:

§ 413.75 Direct GME payments: General requirements.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

* * * * *

All or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting means—

(1) Effective on or after January 1, 1999 and for cost reporting periods beginning before July 1, 2007, the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries and fringe benefits attributable to direct graduate medical education (GME); and

(2) Effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the residents' salaries and fringe benefits (including travel and lodging where applicable) and the portion of the cost of teaching physicians' salaries attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities.

* * * * *

■ 11. Section 413.78 is amended by—

■ A. Revising the introductory text of paragraph (e).

■ B. Adding new paragraph (f).

The revision and addition read as follows:

§ 413.78 Direct GME payments: Determination of the total number of FTE residents.

* * * * *

(e) For portions of cost reporting periods occurring on or after October 1, 2004, and for cost reporting periods beginning before July 1, 2007, the time residents spend in nonprovider settings such as freestanding clinics, nursing homes, and physicians' offices in connection with approved programs may be included in determining the number of FTE residents in the calculation of a hospital's resident count if the following conditions are met:

* * * * *

(f) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2007, the time residents spend in non-provider settings such as freestanding clinics, nursing homes, and physicians' offices in connection with approved programs may be included in determining the number of FTE residents the calculation of a hospital's resident count if the following conditions are met—

(1) The resident spends his or her time in patient care activities.

(2) The hospital must incur all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in the nonhospital setting(s) (in accordance with the definition under § 413.75(b)).

(3) The hospital must comply with one of the following:

(i) The hospital must pay for all or substantially all of the costs for the training program in a nonhospital setting(s) attributable to training that occurs during a month by the end of the third month following the month in which the training in the nonhospital site occurred; or

(ii) There is a written agreement in place between the hospital and the nonhospital site before the training begins that states that the hospital will incur at least 90 percent of the total of the costs of the resident's salary and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable) while the resident is training in the nonhospital site and the portion of the cost of the teaching physician's salary attributable to nonpatient care direct GME activities. The written agreement must specify the total cost of the training program at the nonhospital site, and the amount the hospital will incur (at least 90 percent of the total), and must indicate the portion of the amount the hospital will incur that reflects residents' salaries and fringe benefits (and travel and lodging where applicable), and the portion of this amount that reflects teaching physician compensation. Hospitals may modify the amounts specified in the written agreement by the end of the academic year (that is, June 30) to reflect that at least 90 percent of the costs of the training program in the nonhospital site has been incurred.

(4) The hospital is subject to the principles of community support and redistribution of costs as specified in § 413.81.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.773, Medicare—Hospital Insurance; and Program No. 93.774, Medicare—Supplementary Medical Insurance Program)

Dated: April 24, 2007.

Leslie V. Norwalk,

Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Approved: April 30, 2007.

Michael O. Leavitt,

Secretary.

The following addenda will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Addendum

Addendum A contains the tables referred to throughout the preamble to this final rule. The tables presented below are as follows:

Table 1: Long-Term Care Hospital Wage Index for Urban Areas for Discharges Occurring from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

Table 2: Long-Term Care Hospital Wage Index for Rural Areas for Discharges Occurring from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

Table 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRG Relative Weights, Geometric Average Length of Stay, and Five-sixths of the Geometric Average Length of Stay (for Short-Stay Outlier Cases) (effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007), and the IPPS Average Length of Stay plus one Standard Deviation (for the Short-Stay Outlier policy). (Note: The first four

columns of this table are the same information provided in Table 11 of the FY 2007 IPPS final rule (71 FR 48321 through 48331), which has been reprinted here for convenience. The fifth column of this table was added to provide information on the revision to the short-stay outlier policy, discussed in section VI.A.2. of the preamble of this final rule.)

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
10180	Abilene, TX	0.8000	0.8400
	Callahan County, TX.		
	Jones County, TX.		
	Taylor County, TX.		
10380	Aguadilla-Isabela-San Sebastián, PR	0.3915	0.5132
	Aguada Municipio, PR.		
	Aguadilla Municipio, PR.		
	Añasco Municipio, PR.		
	Isabela Municipio, PR.		
	Lares Municipio, PR.		
	Moca Municipio, PR.		
	Rincón Municipio, PR.		
	San Sebastián Municipio, PR.		
10420	Akron, OH	0.8654	0.8923
	Portage County, OH.		
	Summit County, OH.		
10500	Albany, GA	0.8991	0.9193
	Baker County, GA.		
	Dougherty County, GA.		
	Lee County, GA.		
	Terrell County, GA.		
	Worth County, GA.		
10580	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	0.8720	0.8976
	Albany County, NY.		
	Rensselaer County, NY.		
	Saratoga County, NY.		
	Schenectady County, NY.		
	Schoharie County, NY.		
10740	Albuquerque, NM	0.9458	0.9566
	Bernalillo County, NM.		
	Sandoval County, NM.		
	Torrance County, NM.		
	Valencia County, NM.		
10780	Alexandria, LA	0.8006	0.8405
	Grant Parish, LA.		
	Rapides Parish, LA.		
10900	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	0.9947	0.9958
	Warren County, NJ.		
	Carbon County, PA.		
	Lehigh County, PA.		
	Northampton County, PA.		
11020	Altoona, PA	0.8812	0.9050
	Blair County, PA.		
11100	Amarillo, TX	0.9169	0.9335
	Armstrong County, TX.		
	Carson County, TX.		
	Potter County, TX.		
	Randall County, TX.		
11180	Ames, IA	0.9760	0.9808
	Story County, IA.		
11260	Anchorage, AK	1.2023	1.1618
	Anchorage Municipality, AK.		
	Matanuska-Susitna Borough, AK.		
11300	Anderson, IN	0.8681	0.8945
	Madison County, IN.		
11340	Anderson, SC	0.9017	0.9214
	Anderson County, SC.		
11460	Ann Arbor, MI	1.0826	1.0661
	Washtenaw County, MI.		
11500	Anniston-Oxford, AL	0.7770	0.8216
	Calhoun County, AL.		
11540	Appleton, WI	0.9455	0.9564
	Calumet County, WI.		
	Outagamie County, WI.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
11700	Asheville, NC	0.9216	0.9373
	Buncombe County, NC.		
	Haywood County, NC.		
	Henderson County, NC.		
	Madison County, NC.		
12020	Athens-Clarke County, GA	0.9856	0.9885
	Clarke County, GA.		
	Madison County, GA.		
	Oconee County, GA.		
	Oglethorpe County, GA.		
12060	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	0.9762	0.9810
	Barrow County, GA.		
	Bartow County, GA.		
	Butts County, GA.		
	Carroll County, GA.		
	Cherokee County, GA.		
	Clayton County, GA.		
	Cobb County, GA.		
	Coweta County, GA.		
	Dawson County, GA.		
	DeKalb County, GA.		
	Douglas County, GA.		
	Fayette County, GA.		
	Forsyth County, GA.		
	Fulton County, GA.		
	Gwinnett County, GA.		
	Haralson County, GA.		
	Heard County, GA.		
	Henry County, GA.		
	Jasper County, GA.		
	Lamar County, GA.		
	Meriwether County, GA.		
	Newton County, GA.		
	Paulding County, GA.		
	Pickens County, GA.		
	Pike County, GA.		
	Rockdale County, GA.		
	Spalding County, GA.		
	Walton County, GA.		
12100	Atlantic City, NJ	1.1831	1.1465
	Atlantic County, NJ.		
12220	Auburn-Opelika, AL	0.8096	0.8477
	Lee County, AL.		
12260	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	0.9667	0.9734
	Burke County, GA.		
	Columbia County, GA.		
	McDuffie County, GA.		
	Richmond County, GA.		
	Aiken County, SC.		
	Edgefield County, SC.		
12420	Austin-Round Rock, TX	0.9344	0.9475
	Bastrop County, TX.		
	Caldwell County, TX.		
	Hays County, TX.		
	Travis County, TX.		
	Williamson County, TX.		
12540	Bakersfield, CA	1.0725	1.0580
	Kern County, CA.		
12580	Baltimore-Towson, MD	1.0088	1.0070
	Anne Arundel County, MD.		
	Baltimore County, MD.		
	Carroll County, MD.		
	Harford County, MD.		
	Howard County, MD.		
	Queen Anne's County, MD.		
	Baltimore City, MD.		
12620	Bangor, ME	0.9711	0.9769
	Penobscot County, ME.		
12700	Barnstable Town, MA	1.2539	1.2031

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Barnstable County, MA.		
12940	Baton Rouge, LA	0.8084	0.8467
	Ascension Parish, LA.		
	East Baton Rouge Parish, LA.		
	East Feliciana Parish, LA.		
	Iberville Parish, LA.		
	Livingston Parish, LA.		
	Pointe Coupee Parish, LA.		
	St. Helena Parish, LA.		
	West Baton Rouge Parish, LA.		
	West Feliciana Parish, LA.		
12980	Battle Creek, MI	0.9762	0.9810
	Calhoun County, MI.		
13020	Bay City, MI	0.9251	0.9401
	Bay County, MI.		
13140	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	0.8595	0.8876
	Hardin County, TX.		
	Jefferson County, TX.		
	Orange County, TX.		
13380	Bellingham, WA	1.1104	1.0883
	Whatcom County, WA.		
13460	Bend, OR	1.0743	1.0594
	Deschutes County, OR.		
13644	Bethesda-Gaithersburg-Frederick, MD	1.0903	1.0722
	Frederick County, MD.		
	Montgomery County, MD.		
13740	Billings, MT	0.8712	0.8970
	Carbon County, MT.		
	Yellowstone County, MT.		
13780	Binghamton, NY	0.8786	0.9029
	Broome County, NY.		
	Tioga County, NY.		
13820	Birmingham-Hoover, AL	0.8894	0.9115
	Bibb County, AL.		
	Blount County, AL.		
	Chilton County, AL.		
	Jefferson County, AL.		
	St. Clair County, AL.		
	Shelby County, AL.		
	Walker County, AL.		
13900	Bismarck, ND	0.7240	0.7792
	Burleigh County, ND.		
	Morton County, ND.		
13980	Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA	0.8213	0.8570
	Giles County, VA.		
	Montgomery County, VA.		
	Pulaski County, VA.		
	Radford City, VA.		
14020	Bloomington, IN	0.8533	0.8826
	Greene County, IN.		
	Monroe County, IN.		
	Owen County, IN.		
14060	Bloomington-Normal, IL	0.8944	0.9155
	McLean County, IL.		
14260	Boise City-Nampa, ID	0.9401	0.9521
	Ada County, ID.		
	Boise County, ID.		
	Canyon County, ID.		
	Gem County, ID.		
	Owyhee County, ID.		
14484	Boston-Quincy, MA	1.1679	1.1343
	Norfolk County, MA.		
	Plymouth County, MA.		
	Suffolk County, MA.		
14500	Boulder, CO	1.0350	1.0280
	Boulder County, CO.		
14540	Bowling Green, KY	0.8148	0.8518
	Edmonson County, KY.		
	Warren County, KY.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
14740	Bremerton-Silverdale, WA	1.0913	1.0730
	Kitsap County, WA.		
14860	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	1.2659	1.2127
	Fairfield County, CT.		
15180	Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	0.9430	0.9544
	Cameron County, TX.		
15260	Brunswick, GA	1.0164	1.0131
	Brantley County, GA.		
	Glynn County, GA.		
	McIntosh County, GA.		
15380	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	0.9424	0.9539
	Erie County, NY.		
	Niagara County, NY.		
15500	Burlington, NC	0.8674	0.8939
	Alamance County, NC.		
15540	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	0.9474	0.9579
	Chittenden County, VT.		
	Franklin County, VT.		
	Grand Isle County, VT.		
15764	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA	1.0970	1.0776
	Middlesex County, MA.		
15804	Camden, NJ	1.0392	1.0314
	Burlington County, NJ.		
	Camden County, NJ.		
	Gloucester County, NJ.		
15940	Canton-Massillon, OH	0.9031	0.9225
	Carroll County, OH.		
	Stark County, OH.		
15980	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	0.9342	0.9474
	Lee County, FL.		
16180	Carson City, NV	1.0025	1.0020
	Carson City, NV.		
16220	Casper, WY	0.9145	0.9316
	Natrona County, WY.		
16300	Cedar Rapids, IA	0.8888	0.9110
	Benton County, IA.		
	Jones County, IA.		
	Linn County, IA.		
16580	Champaign-Urbana, IL	0.9644	0.9715
	Champaign County, IL.		
	Ford County, IL.		
	Piatt County, IL.		
16620	Charleston, WV	0.8542	0.8834
	Boone County, WV.		
	Clay County, WV.		
	Kanawha County, WV.		
	Lincoln County, WV.		
	Putnam County, WV.		
16700	Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.9145	0.9316
	Berkeley County, SC.		
	Charleston County, SC.		
	Dorchester County, SC.		
16740	Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	0.9554	0.9643
	Anson County, NC.		
	Cabarrus County, NC.		
	Gaston County, NC.		
	Mecklenburg County, NC.		
	Union County, NC.		
	York County, SC.		
16820	Charlottesville, VA	1.0125	1.0100
	Albemarle County, VA.		
	Fluvanna County, VA.		
	Greene County, VA.		
	Nelson County, VA.		
	Charlottesville City, VA.		
16860	Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.8948	0.9158
	Catoosa County, GA.		
	Dade County, GA.		
	Walker County, GA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Hamilton County, TN.		
	Marion County, TN.		
	Sequatchie County, TN.		
16940	Cheyenne, WY	0.9060	0.9248
	Laramie County, WY.		
16974	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL	1.0751	1.0601
	Cook County, IL.		
	DeKalb County, IL.		
	DuPage County, IL.		
	Grundy County, IL.		
	Kane County, IL.		
	Kendall County, IL.		
	McHenry County, IL.		
	Will County, IL.		
17020	Chico, CA	1.1053	1.0842
	Butte County, CA.		
17140	Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	0.9601	0.9681
	Dearborn County, IN.		
	Franklin County, IN.		
	Ohio County, IN.		
	Boone County, KY.		
	Bracken County, KY.		
	Campbell County, KY.		
	Gallatin County, KY.		
	Grant County, KY.		
	Kenton County, KY.		
	Pendleton County, KY.		
	Brown County, OH.		
	Butler County, OH.		
	Clermont County, OH.		
	Hamilton County, OH.		
	Warren County, OH.		
17300	Clarksville, TN-KY	0.8436	0.8749
	Christian County, KY.		
	Trigg County, KY.		
	Montgomery County, TN.		
	Stewart County, TN.		
17420	Cleveland, TN	0.8109	0.8487
	Bradley County, TN.		
	Polk County, TN.		
17460	Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	0.9400	0.9520
	Cuyahoga County, OH.		
	Geauga County, OH.		
	Lake County, OH.		
	Lorain County, OH.		
	Medina County, OH.		
17660	Coeur d'Alene, ID	0.9344	0.9475
	Kootenai County, ID.		
17780	College Station-Bryan, TX	0.9045	0.9236
	Brazos County, TX.		
	Burleson County, TX.		
	Robertson County, TX.		
17820	Colorado Springs, CO	0.9701	0.9761
	El Paso County, CO.		
	Teller County, CO.		
17860	Columbia, MO	0.8542	0.8834
	Boone County, MO.		
	Howard County, MO.		
17900	Columbia, SC	0.8933	0.9146
	Calhoun County, SC.		
	Fairfield County, SC.		
	Kershaw County, SC.		
	Lexington County, SC.		
	Richland County, SC.		
	Saluda County, SC.		
17980	Columbus, GA-AL	0.8239	0.8591
	Russell County, AL.		
	Chattahoochee County, GA.		
	Harris County, GA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Marion County, GA.		
	Muscogee County, GA.		
18020	Columbus, IN	0.9318	0.9454
	Bartholomew County, IN.		
18140	Columbus, OH	1.0107	1.0086
	Delaware County, OH.		
	Fairfield County, OH.		
	Franklin County, OH.		
	Licking County, OH.		
	Madison County, OH.		
	Morrow County, OH.		
	Pickaway County, OH.		
	Union County, OH.		
18580	Corpus Christi, TX	0.8564	0.8851
	Aransas County, TX.		
	Nueces County, TX.		
	San Patricio County, TX.		
18700	Corvallis, OR	1.1546	1.1237
	Benton County, OR.		
19060	Cumberland, MD-WV	0.8446	0.8757
	Allegany County, MD.		
	Mineral County, WV.		
19124	Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX	1.0075	1.0060
	Collin County, TX.		
	Dallas County, TX.		
	Delta County, TX.		
	Denton County, TX.		
	Ellis County, TX.		
	Hunt County, TX.		
	Kaufman County, TX.		
	Rockwall County, TX.		
19140	Dalton, GA	0.9093	0.9274
	Murray County, GA.		
	Whitfield County, GA.		
19180	Danville, IL	0.9266	0.9413
	Vermilion County, IL.		
19260	Danville, VA	0.8451	0.8761
	Pittsylvania County, VA.		
	Danville City, VA.		
19340	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	0.8846	0.9077
	Henry County, IL.		
	Mercer County, IL.		
	Rock Island County, IL.		
	Scott County, IA.		
19380	Dayton, OH	0.9037	0.9230
	Greene County, OH.		
	Miami County, OH.		
	Montgomery County, OH.		
	Preble County, OH.		
19460	Decatur, AL	0.8159	0.8527
	Lawrence County, AL.		
	Morgan County, AL.		
19500	Decatur, IL	0.8172	0.8538
	Macon County, IL.		
19660	Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	0.9263	0.9410
	Volusia County, FL.		
19740	Denver-Aurora, CO	1.0930	1.0744
	Adams County, CO.		
	Arapahoe County, CO.		
	Broomfield County, CO.		
	Clear Creek County, CO.		
	Denver County, CO.		
	Douglas County, CO.		
	Elbert County, CO.		
	Gilpin County, CO.		
	Jefferson County, CO.		
	Park County, CO.		
19780	Des Moines,-West Des Moines, IA	0.9214	0.9371
	Dallas County, IA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Guthrie County, IA.		
	Madison County, IA.		
	Polk County, IA.		
	Warren County, IA.		
19804	Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn, MI	1.0281	1.0225
	Wayne County, MI.		
20020	Dothan, AL	0.7381	0.7905
	Geneva County, AL.		
	Henry County, AL.		
	Houston County, AL.		
20100	Dover, DE	0.9847	0.9878
	Kent County, DE.		
20220	Dubuque, IA	0.9133	0.9306
	Dubuque County, IA.		
20260	Duluth, MN-WI	1.0042	1.0034
	Carlton County, MN.		
	St. Louis County, MN.		
	Douglas County, WI.		
20500	Durham, NC	0.9826	0.9861
	Chatham County, NC.		
	Durham County, NC.		
	Orange County, NC.		
	Person County, NC.		
20740	Eau Claire, WI	0.9630	0.9704
	Chippewa County, WI.		
	Eau Claire County, WI.		
20764	Edison, NJ	1.1190	1.0952
	Middlesex County, NJ.		
	Monmouth County, NJ.		
	Ocean County, NJ.		
	Somerset County, NJ.		
20940	El Centro, CA	0.9076	0.9261
	Imperial County, CA.		
21060	Elizabethtown, KY	0.8697	0.8958
	Hardin County, KY.		
	Larue County, KY.		
21140	Elkhart-Goshen, IN	0.9426	0.9541
	Elkhart County, IN.		
21300	Elmira, NY	0.8240	0.8592
	Chemung County, NY.		
21340	El Paso, TX	0.9053	0.9242
	El Paso County, TX.		
21500	Erie, PA	0.8827	0.9062
	Erie County, PA.		
21604	Essex County, MA	1.0418	1.0334
	Essex County, MA.		
21660	Eugene-Springfield, OR	1.0876	1.0701
	Lane County, OR.		
21780	Evansville, IN-KY	0.9071	0.9257
	Gibson County, IN.		
	Posey County, IN.		
	Vanderburgh County, IN.		
	Warrick County, IN.		
	Henderson County, KY.		
	Webster County, KY.		
21820	Fairbanks, AK	1.1059	1.0847
	Fairbanks North Star Borough, AK.		
21940	Fajardo, PR	0.4036	0.5229
	Ceiba Municipio, PR.		
	Fajardo Municipio, PR.		
	Luquillo Municipio, PR.		
22020	Fargo, ND-MN	0.8250	0.8600
	Cass County, ND.		
	Clay County, MN.		
22140	Farmington, NM	0.8589	0.8871
	San Juan County, NM.		
22180	Fayetteville, NC	0.8945	0.9156
	Cumberland County, NC.		
	Hoke County, NC.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
22220	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO Benton County, AR. Madison County, AR. Washington County, AR. McDonald County, MO.	0.8865	0.9092
22380	Flagstaff, AZ Coconino County, AZ.	1.1601	1.1281
22420	Flint, MI Genesee County, MI.	1.0969	1.0775
22500	Florence, SC Darlington County, SC. Florence County, SC.	0.8388	0.8710
22520	Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL Colbert County, AL. Lauderdale County, AL.	0.7843	0.8274
22540	Fond du Lac, WI Fond du Lac County, WI.	1.0063	1.0050
22660	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO Larimer County, CO.	0.9544	0.9635
22744	Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach-Deerfield Beach, FL Broward County, FL.	1.0133	1.0106
22900	Fort Smith, AR-OK Crawford County, AR. Franklin County, AR. Sebastian County, AR. Le Flore County, OK. Sequoyah County, OK.	0.7731	0.8185
23020	Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL Okaloosa County, FL.	0.8643	0.8914
23060	Fort Wayne, IN Allen County, IN. Wells County, IN. Whitley County, IN.	0.9517	0.9614
23104	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX Johnson County, TX. Parker County, TX. Tarrant County, TX. Wise County, TX.	0.9569	0.9655
23420	Fresno, CA Fresno County, CA.	1.0943	1.0754
23460	Gadsden, AL Etowah County, AL.	0.8066	0.8453
23540	Gainesville, FL Alachua County, FL. Gilchrist County, FL.	0.9277	0.9422
23580	Gainesville, GA Hall County, GA.	0.8958	0.9166
23844	Gary, IN Jasper County, IN. Lake County, IN. Newton County, IN. Porter County, IN.	0.9334	0.9467
24020	Glens Falls, NY Warren County, NY. Washington County, NY.	0.8324	0.8659
24140	Goldsboro, NC Wayne County, NC.	0.9171	0.9337
24220	Grand Forks, ND-MN Polk County, MN. Grand Forks County, ND.	0.7949	0.8359
24300	Grand Junction, CO Mesa County, CO.	0.9668	0.9734
24340	Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI Barry County, MI. Ionia County, MI. Kent County, MI. Newaygo County, MI.	0.9455	0.9564
24500	Great Falls, MT Cascade County, MT.	0.8598	0.8878

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
24540	Greeley, CO Weld County, CO.	0.9602	0.9682
24580	Green Bay, WI Brown County, WI. Kewaunee County, WI. Oconto County, WI.	0.9787	0.9830
24660	Greensboro-High Point, NC Guilford County, NC. Randolph County, NC. Rockingham County, NC.	0.8866	0.9093
24780	Greenville, NC Greene County, NC. Pitt County, NC.	0.9432	0.9546
24860	Greenville, SC Greenville County, SC. Laurens County, SC. Pickens County, SC.	0.9804	0.9843
25020	Guayama, PR Arroyo Municipio, PR. Guayama Municipio, PR. Patillas Municipio, PR.	0.3235	0.4588
25060	Gulfport-Biloxi, MS Hancock County, MS. Harrison County, MS. Stone County, MS.	0.8915	0.9132
25180	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV Washington County, MD. Berkeley County, WV. Morgan County, WV.	0.9038	0.9230
25260	Hanford-Corcoran, CA Kings County, CA.	1.0282	1.0226
25420	Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA Cumberland County, PA. Dauphin County, PA. Perry County, PA.	0.9402	0.9522
25500	Harrisonburg, VA Rockingham County, VA. Harrisonburg City, VA.	0.9073	0.9258
25540	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT Hartford County, CT. Litchfield County, CT. Middlesex County, CT. Tolland County, CT.	1.0894	1.0715
25620	Hattiesburg, MS Forrest County, MS. Lamar County, MS. Perry County, MS.	0.7430	0.7944
25860	Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC Alexander County, NC. Burke County, NC. Caldwell County, NC. Catawba County, NC.	0.9010	0.9208
26100	Holland-Grand Haven, MI Ottawa County, MI.	0.9163	0.9330
26180	Honolulu, HI Honolulu County, HI.	1.1096	1.0877
26300	Hot Springs, AR Garland County, AR.	0.8782	0.9026
26380	Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA Lafourche Parish, LA. Terrebonne Parish, LA.	0.8082	0.8466
26420	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX Austin County, TX. Brazoria County, TX. Chambers County, TX. Fort Bend County, TX. Galveston County, TX. Harris County, TX. Liberty County, TX.	1.0008	1.0006

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Montgomery County, TX.		
	San Jacinto County, TX.		
	Waller County, TX.		
26580	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	0.8997	0.9198
	Boyd County, KY.		
	Greenup County, KY.		
	Lawrence County, OH.		
	Cabell County, WV.		
	Wayne County, WV.		
26620	Huntsville, AL	0.9007	0.9206
	Limestone County, AL.		
	Madison County, AL.		
26820	Idaho Falls, ID	0.9088	0.9270
	Bonneville County, ID.		
	Jefferson County, ID.		
26900	Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	0.9895	0.9916
	Boone County, IN.		
	Brown County, IN.		
	Hamilton County, IN.		
	Hancock County, IN.		
	Hendricks County, IN.		
	Johnson County, IN.		
	Marion County, IN.		
	Morgan County, IN.		
	Putnam County, IN.		
	Shelby County, IN.		
26980	Iowa City, IA	0.9714	0.9771
	Johnson County, IA.		
	Washington County, IA.		
27060	Ithaca, NY	0.9928	0.9942
	Tompkins County, NY.		
27100	Jackson, MI	0.9560	0.9648
	Jackson County, MI.		
27140	Jackson, MS	0.8271	0.8617
	Copiah County, MS.		
	Hinds County, MS.		
	Madison County, MS.		
	Rankin County, MS.		
	Simpson County, MS.		
27180	Jackson, TN	0.8853	0.9082
	Chester County, TN.		
	Madison County, TN.		
27260	Jacksonville, FL	0.9165	0.9332
	Baker County, FL.		
	Clay County, FL.		
	Duval County, FL.		
	Nassau County, FL.		
	St. Johns County, FL.		
27340	Jacksonville, NC	0.8231	0.8585
	Onslow County, NC.		
27500	Janesville, WI	0.9655	0.9724
	Rock County, WI.		
27620	Jefferson City, MO	0.8332	0.8666
	Callaway County, MO.		
	Cole County, MO.		
	Moniteau County, MO.		
	Osage County, MO.		
27740	Johnson City, TN	0.8043	0.8434
	Carter County, TN.		
	Unicoi County, TN.		
	Washington County, TN.		
27780	Johnstown, PA	0.8620	0.8896
	Cambria County, PA.		
27860	Jonesboro, AR	0.7662	0.8130
	Craighead County, AR.		
	Poinsett County, AR.		
27900	Joplin, MO	0.8605	0.8884
	Jasper County, MO.		
	Newton County, MO.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
28020	Kalamazoo-Portage, MI	1.0704	1.0563
	Kalamazoo County, MI.		
	Van Buren County, MI.		
28100	Kankakee-Bradley, IL	1.0083	1.0066
	Kankakee County, IL.		
28140	Kansas City, MO-KS	0.9495	0.9596
	Franklin County, KS.		
	Johnson County, KS.		
	Leavenworth County, KS.		
	Linn County, KS.		
	Miami County, KS.		
	Wyandotte County, KS.		
	Bates County, MO.		
	Caldwell County, MO.		
	Cass County, MO.		
	Clay County, MO.		
	Clinton County, MO.		
	Jackson County, MO.		
	Lafayette County, MO.		
	Platte County, MO.		
	Ray County, MO.		
28420	Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WA	1.0343	1.0274
	Benton County, WA.		
	Franklin County, WA.		
28660	Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	0.8901	0.9121
	Bell County, TX.		
	Coryell County, TX.		
	Lampasas County, TX.		
28700	Kingsport-Bristol-Bristol, TN-VA	0.7985	0.8388
	Hawkins County, TN.		
	Sullivan County, TN.		
	Bristol City, VA.		
	Scott County, VA.		
	Washington County, VA.		
28740	Kingston, NY	0.9367	0.9494
	Ulster County, NY.		
28940	Knoxville, TN	0.8249	0.8599
	Anderson County, TN.		
	Blount County, TN.		
	Knox County, TN.		
	Loudon County, TN.		
	Union County, TN.		
29020	Kokomo, IN	0.9669	0.9735
	Howard County, IN.		
	Tipton County, IN.		
29100	La Crosse, WI-MN	0.9426	0.9541
	Houston County, MN.		
	La Crosse County, WI.		
29140	Lafayette, IN	0.8931	0.9145
	Benton County, IN.		
	Carroll County, IN.		
	Tippecanoe County, IN.		
29180	Lafayette, LA	0.8289	0.8631
	Lafayette Parish, LA.		
	St. Martin Parish, LA.		
29340	Lake Charles, LA	0.7914	0.8331
	Calcasieu Parish, LA.		
	Cameron Parish, LA.		
29404	Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI	1.0570	1.0456
	Lake County, IL.		
	Kenosha County, WI.		
29460	Lakeland, FL	0.8879	0.9103
	Polk County, FL.		
29540	Lancaster, PA	0.9589	0.9671
	Lancaster County, PA.		
29620	Lansing-East Lansing, MI	1.0088	1.0070
	Clinton County, MI.		
	Eaton County, MI.		
	Ingham County, MI.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
29700	Laredo, TX	0.7811	0.8249
	Webb County, TX.		
29740	Las Cruces, NM	0.9273	0.9418
	Dona Ana County, NM.		
29820	Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	1.1430	1.1144
	Clark County, NV.		
29940	Lawrence, KS	0.8365	0.8692
	Douglas County, KS.		
30020	Lawton, OK	0.8065	0.8452
	Comanche County, OK.		
30140	Lebanon, PA	0.8679	0.8943
	Lebanon County, PA.		
30300	Lewiston, ID-WA	0.9853	0.9882
	Nez Perce County, ID.		
	Asotin County, WA.		
30340	Lewiston-Auburn, ME	0.9126	0.9301
	Androscoggin County, ME.		
30460	Lexington-Fayette, KY	0.9181	0.9345
	Bourbon County, KY.		
	Clark County, KY.		
	Fayette County, KY.		
	Jessamine County, KY.		
	Scott County, KY.		
	Woodford County, KY.		
30620	Lima, OH	0.9042	0.9234
	Allen County, OH.		
30700	Lincoln, NE	1.0092	1.0074
	Lancaster County, NE.		
	Seward County, NE.		
30780	Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	0.8890	0.9112
	Faulkner County, AR.		
	Grant County, AR.		
	Lonoke County, AR.		
	Perry County, AR.		
	Pulaski County, AR.		
	Saline County, AR.		
30860	Logan, UT-ID	0.9022	0.9218
	Franklin County, ID.		
	Cache County, UT.		
30980	Longview, TX	0.8788	0.9030
	Gregg County, TX.		
	Rusk County, TX.		
	Upshur County, TX.		
31020	Longview, WA	1.0011	1.0009
	Cowlitz County, WA.		
31084	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA	1.1760	1.1408
	Los Angeles County, CA.		
31140	Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	0.9118	0.9294
	Clark County, IN.		
	Floyd County, IN.		
	Harrison County, IN.		
	Washington County, IN.		
	Bullitt County, KY.		
	Henry County, KY.		
	Jefferson County, KY.		
	Meade County, KY.		
	Nelson County, KY.		
	Oldham County, KY.		
	Shelby County, KY.		
	Spencer County, KY.		
	Trimble County, KY.		
31180	Lubbock, TX	0.8613	0.8890
	Crosby County, TX.		
	Lubbock County, TX.		
31340	Lynchburg, VA	0.8694	0.8955
	Amherst County, VA.		
	Appomattox County, VA.		
	Bedford County, VA.		
	Campbell County, VA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Bedford City, VA.		
	Lynchburg City, VA.		
31420	Macon, GA	0.9519	0.9615
	Bibb County, GA.		
	Crawford County, GA.		
	Jones County, GA.		
	Monroe County, GA.		
	Twiggs County, GA.		
31460	Madera, CA	0.8154	0.8523
	Madera County, CA.		
31540	Madison, WI	1.0840	1.0672
	Columbia County, WI.		
	Dane County, WI.		
	Iowa County, WI.		
31700	Manchester-Nashua, NH	1.0243	1.0194
	Hillsborough County, NH.		
	Merrimack County, NH.		
31900	Mansfield, OH	0.9271	0.9417
	Richland County, OH.		
32420	Mayagüez, PR	0.3848	0.5078
	Hormigueros Municipio, PR.		
	Mayagüez Municipio, PR.		
32580	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	0.8773	0.9018
	Hidalgo County, TX.		
32780	Medford, OR	1.0818	1.0654
	Jackson County, OR.		
32820	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	0.9373	0.9498
	Crittenden County, AR.		
	DeSoto County, MS.		
	Marshall County, MS.		
	Tate County, MS.		
	Tunica County, MS.		
	Fayette County, TN.		
	Shelby County, TN.		
	Tipton County, TN.		
32900	Merced, CA	1.1471	1.1177
	Merced County, CA.		
33124	Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL	0.9812	0.9850
	Miami-Dade County, FL.		
33140	Michigan City-La Porte, IN	0.9118	0.9294
	LaPorte County, IN.		
33260	Midland, TX	0.9786	0.9829
	Midland County, TX.		
33340	Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	1.0218	1.0174
	Milwaukee County, WI.		
	Ozaukee County, WI.		
	Washington County, WI.		
	Waukesha County, WI.		
33460	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	1.0946	1.0757
	Anoka County, MN.		
	Carver County, MN.		
	Chisago County, MN.		
	Dakota County, MN.		
	Hennepin County, MN.		
	Isanti County, MN.		
	Ramsey County, MN.		
	Scott County, MN.		
	Sherburne County, MN.		
	Washington County, MN.		
	Wright County, MN.		
	Pierce County, WI.		
	St. Croix County, WI.		
33540	Missoula, MT	0.8928	0.9142
	Missoula County, MT.		
33660	Mobile, AL	0.7913	0.8330
	Mobile County, AL.		
33700	Modesto, CA	1.1729	1.1383
	Stanislaus County, CA.		
33740	Monroe, LA	0.7997	0.8398

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Ouachita Parish, LA.		
	Union Parish, LA.		
33780	Monroe, MI	0.9707	0.9766
	Monroe County, MI.		
33860	Montgomery, AL	0.8009	0.8407
	Autauga County, AL.		
	Elmore County, AL.		
	Lowndes County, AL.		
	Montgomery County, AL.		
34060	Morgantown, WV	0.8423	0.8738
	Monongalia County, WV.		
	Preston County, WV.		
34100	Morristown, TN	0.7933	0.8346
	Grainger County, TN.		
	Hamblen County, TN.		
	Jefferson County, TN.		
34580	Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA	1.0517	1.0414
	Skagit County, WA.		
34620	Muncie, IN	0.8562	0.8850
	Delaware County, IN.		
34740	Muskegon-Norton Shores, MI	0.9941	0.9953
	Muskegon County, MI.		
34820	Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC	0.8810	0.9048
	Horry County, SC.		
34900	Napa, CA	1.3374	1.2699
	Napa County, CA.		
34940	Naples-Marco Island, FL	0.9941	0.9953
	Collier County, FL.		
34980	Nashville-Davidson—Murfreesboro, TN	0.9847	0.9878
	Cannon County, TN.		
	Cheatham County, TN.		
	Davidson County, TN.		
	Dickson County, TN.		
	Hickman County, TN.		
	Macon County, TN.		
	Robertson County, TN.		
	Rutherford County, TN.		
	Smith County, TN.		
	Sumner County, TN.		
	Trousdale County, TN.		
	Williamson County, TN.		
	Wilson County, TN.		
35004	Nassau-Suffolk, NY	1.2662	1.2130
	Nassau County, NY.		
	Suffolk County, NY.		
35084	Newark-Union, NJ-PA	1.1892	1.1514
	Essex County, NJ.		
	Hunterdon County, NJ.		
	Morris County, NJ.		
	Sussex County, NJ.		
	Union County, NJ.		
	Pike County, PA.		
35300	New Haven-Milford, CT	1.1953	1.1562
	New Haven County, CT.		
35380	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	0.8831	0.9065
	Jefferson Parish, LA.		
	Orleans Parish, LA.		
	Plaquemines Parish, LA.		
	St. Bernard Parish, LA.		
	St. Charles Parish, LA.		
	St. John the Baptist Parish, LA.		
	St. Tammany Parish, LA.		
35644	New York-White Plains-Wayne, NY-NJ	1.3177	1.2542
	Bergen County, NJ.		
	Hudson County, NJ.		
	Passaic County, NJ.		
	Bronx County, NY.		
	Kings County, NY.		
	New York County, NY.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Putnam County, NY.		
	Queens County, NY.		
	Richmond County, NY.		
	Rockland County, NY.		
	Westchester County, NY.		
35660	Niles-Benton Harbor, MI	0.8915	0.9132
	Berrien County, MI.		
35980	Norwich-New London, CT	1.1932	1.1546
	New London County, CT.		
36084	Oakland-Fremont-Hayward, CA	1.5819	1.4655
	Alameda County, CA.		
	Contra Costa County, CA.		
36100	Ocala, FL	0.8867	0.9094
	Marion County, FL.		
36140	Ocean City, NJ	1.0472	1.0378
	Cape May County, NJ.		
36220	Odessa, TX	1.0073	1.0058
	Ector County, TX.		
36260	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	0.8995	0.9196
	Davis County, UT.		
	Morgan County, UT.		
	Weber County, UT.		
36420	Oklahoma City, OK	0.8843	0.9074
	Canadian County, OK.		
	Cleveland County, OK.		
	Grady County, OK.		
	Lincoln County, OK.		
	Logan County, OK.		
	McClain County, OK.		
	Oklahoma County, OK.		
36500	Olympia, WA	1.1081	1.0865
	Thurston County, WA.		
36540	Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	0.9450	0.9560
	Harrison County, IA.		
	Mills County, IA.		
	Pottawattamie County, IA.		
	Cass County, NE.		
	Douglas County, NE.		
	Sarpy County, NE.		
	Saunders County, NE.		
	Washington County, NE.		
36740	Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	0.9452	0.9562
	Lake County, FL.		
	Orange County, FL.		
	Osceola County, FL.		
	Seminole County, FL.		
36780	Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	0.9315	0.9452
	Winnebago County, WI.		
36980	Owensboro, KY	0.8748	0.8998
	Daviess County, KY.		
	Hancock County, KY.		
	McLean County, KY.		
37100	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	1.1546	1.1237
	Ventura County, CA.		
37340	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	0.9443	0.9554
	Brevard County, FL.		
37460	Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL	0.8027	0.8422
	Bay County, FL.		
37620	Parkersburg-Marietta-Vienna, WV-OH	0.7977	0.8382
	Washington County, OH.		
	Pleasants County, WV.		
	Wirt County, WV.		
	Wood County, WV.		
37700	Pascagoula, MS	0.8215	0.8572
	George County, MS.		
	Jackson County, MS.		
37860	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	0.8000	0.8400
	Escambia County, FL.		
	Santa Rosa County, FL.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
37900	Peoria, IL	0.8982	0.9186
	Marshall County, IL.		
	Peoria County, IL.		
	Stark County, IL.		
	Tazewell County, IL.		
	Woodford County, IL.		
37964	Philadelphia, PA	1.0996	1.0797
	Bucks County, PA.		
	Chester County, PA.		
	Delaware County, PA.		
	Montgomery County, PA.		
	Philadelphia County, PA.		
38060	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	1.0287	1.0230
	Maricopa County, AZ.		
	Pinal County, AZ.		
38220	Pine Bluff, AR	0.8383	0.8706
	Cleveland County, AR.		
	Jefferson County, AR.		
	Lincoln County, AR.		
38300	Pittsburgh, PA	0.8674	0.8939
	Allegheny County, PA.		
	Armstrong County, PA.		
	Beaver County, PA.		
	Butler County, PA.		
	Fayette County, PA.		
	Washington County, PA.		
	Westmoreland County, PA.		
38340	Pittsfield, MA	1.0266	1.0213
	Berkshire County, MA.		
38540	Pocatello, ID	0.9400	0.9520
	Bannock County, ID.		
	Power County, ID.		
38660	Ponce, PR	0.4842	0.5874
	Juana Díaz Municipio, PR.		
	Ponce Municipio, PR.		
	Villalba Municipio, PR.		
38860	Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	0.9908	0.9926
	Cumberland County, ME.		
	Sagadahoc County, ME.		
	York County, ME.		
38900	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	1.1416	1.1133
	Clackamas County, OR.		
	Columbia County, OR.		
	Multnomah County, OR.		
	Washington County, OR.		
	Yamhill County, OR.		
	Clark County, WA.		
	Skamania County, WA.		
38940	Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL	0.9833	0.9866
	Martin County, FL.		
	St. Lucie County, FL.		
39100	Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	1.0911	1.0729
	Dutchess County, NY.		
	Orange County, NY.		
39140	Prescott, AZ	0.9836	0.9869
	Yavapai County, AZ.		
39300	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	1.0783	1.0626
	Bristol County, MA.		
	Bristol County, RI.		
	Kent County, RI.		
	Newport County, RI.		
	Providence County, RI.		
	Washington County, RI.		
39340	Provo-Orem, UT	0.9537	0.9630
	Juab County, UT.		
	Utah County, UT.		
39380	Pueblo, CO	0.8753	0.9002
	Pueblo County, CO.		
39460	Punta Gorda, FL	0.9405	0.9524

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Charlotte County, FL.		
39540	Racine, WI	0.9356	0.9485
	Racine County, WI.		
39580	Raleigh-Cary, NC	0.9864	0.9891
	Franklin County, NC.		
	Johnston County, NC.		
	Wake County, NC.		
39660	Rapid City, SD	0.8833	0.9066
	Meade County, SD.		
	Pennington County, SD.		
39740	Reading, PA	0.9622	0.9698
	Berks County, PA.		
39820	Redding, CA	1.3198	1.2558
	Shasta County, CA.		
39900	Reno-Sparks, NV	1.1963	1.1570
	Storey County, NV.		
	Washoe County, NV.		
40060	Richmond, VA	0.9177	0.9342
	Amelia County, VA.		
	Caroline County, VA.		
	Charles City County, VA.		
	Chesterfield County, VA.		
	Cumberland County, VA.		
	Dinwiddie County, VA.		
	Goochland County, VA.		
	Hanover County, VA.		
	Henrico County, VA.		
	King and Queen County, VA.		
	King William County, VA.		
	Louisa County, VA.		
	New Kent County, VA.		
	Powhatan County, VA.		
	Prince George County, VA.		
	Sussex County, VA.		
	Colonial Heights City, VA.		
	Hopewell City, VA.		
	Petersburg City, VA.		
	Richmond City, VA.		
40140	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	1.0904	1.0723
	Riverside County, CA.		
	San Bernardino County, CA.		
40220	Roanoke, VA	0.8647	0.8918
	Botetourt County, VA.		
	Craig County, VA.		
	Franklin County, VA.		
	Roanoke County, VA.		
	Roanoke City, VA.		
	Salem City, VA.		
40340	Rochester, MN	1.1408	1.1126
	Dodge County, MN.		
	Olmsted County, MN.		
	Wabasha County, MN.		
40380	Rochester, NY	0.8994	0.9195
	Livingston County, NY.		
	Monroe County, NY.		
	Ontario County, NY.		
	Orleans County, NY.		
	Wayne County, NY.		
40420	Rockford, IL	0.9989	0.9991
	Boone County, IL.		
	Winnebago County, IL.		
40484	Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH	1.0159	1.0127
	Rockingham County, NH.		
	Strafford County, NH.		
40580	Rocky Mount, NC	0.8854	0.9083
	Edgecombe County, NC.		
	Nash County, NC.		
40660	Rome, GA	0.9193	0.9354
	Floyd County, GA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
40900	Sacramento—Arden-Arcade—Roseville, CA El Dorado County, CA. Placer County, CA. Sacramento County, CA. Yolo County, CA.	1.3372	1.2698
40980	Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI Saginaw County, MI.	0.8874	0.9099
41060	St. Cloud, MN Benton County, MN. Stearns County, MN.	1.0362	1.0290
41100	St. George, UT Washington County, UT.	0.9265	0.9412
41140	St. Joseph, MO-KS Doniphan County, KS. Andrew County, MO. Buchanan County, MO. DeKalb County, MO.	1.0118	1.0094
41180	St. Louis, MO-IL Bond County, IL. Calhoun County, IL. Clinton County, IL. Jersey County, IL. Macoupin County, IL. Madison County, IL. Monroe County, IL. St. Clair County, IL. Crawford County, MO. Franklin County, MO. Jefferson County, MO. Lincoln County, MO. St. Charles County, MO. St. Louis County, MO. Warren County, MO. Washington County, MO. St. Louis City, MO.	0.9005	0.9204
41420	Salem, OR Marion County, OR. Polk County, OR.	1.0438	1.0350
41500	Salinas, CA Monterey County, CA.	1.4337	1.3470
41540	Salisbury, MD Somerset County, MD. Wicomico County, MD.	0.8953	0.9162
41620	Salt Lake City, UT Salt Lake County, UT. Summit County, UT. Tooele County, UT.	0.9402	0.9522
41660	San Angelo, TX Irion County, TX. Tom Green County, TX.	0.8362	0.8690
41700	San Antonio, TX Atascosa County, TX. Bandera County, TX. Bexar County, TX. Comal County, TX. Guadalupe County, TX. Kendall County, TX. Medina County, TX. Wilson County, TX.	0.8844	0.9075
41740	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA San Diego County, CA.	1.1354	1.1083
41780	Sandusky, OH Erie County, OH.	0.9302	0.9442
41884	San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City, CA Marin County, CA. San Francisco County, CA. San Mateo County, CA.	1.5165	1.4132
41900	San Germán-Cabo Rojo, PR Cabo Rojo Municipio, PR.	0.4885	0.5908

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Lajas Municipio, PR.		
	Sabana Grande Municipio, PR.		
	San Germán Municipio, PR.		
41940	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	1.5543	1.4434
	San Benito County, CA.		
	Santa Clara County, CA.		
41980	San Juan-Caguas-Guaynabo, PR	0.4452	0.5562
	Aguas Buenas Municipio, PR.		
	Aibonito Municipio, PR.		
	Arecibo Municipio, PR.		
	Barceloneta Municipio, PR.		
	Barranquitas Municipio, PR.		
	Bayamón Municipio, PR.		
	Caguas Municipio, PR.		
	Camuy Municipio, PR.		
	Canóvanas Municipio, PR.		
	Carolina Municipio, PR.		
	Cataño Municipio, PR.		
	Cayey Municipio, PR.		
	Ciales Municipio, PR.		
	Cidra Municipio, PR.		
	Comerío Municipio, PR.		
	Corozal Municipio, PR.		
	Dorado Municipio, PR.		
	Florida Municipio, PR.		
	Guaynabo Municipio, PR.		
	Gurabo Municipio, PR.		
	Hatillo Municipio, PR.		
	Humacao Municipio, PR.		
	Juncos Municipio, PR.		
	Las Piedras Municipio, PR.		
	Loíza Municipio, PR.		
	Manatí Municipio, PR.		
	Maunabo Municipio, PR.		
	Morovis Municipio, PR.		
	Naguabo Municipio, PR.		
	Naranjito Municipio, PR.		
	Orocovis Municipio, PR.		
	Quebradillas Municipio, PR.		
	Río Grande Municipio, PR.		
	San Juan Municipio, PR.		
	San Lorenzo Municipio, PR.		
	Toa Alta Municipio, PR.		
	Toa Baja Municipio, PR.		
	Trujillo Alto Municipio, PR.		
	Vega Alta Municipio, PR.		
	Vega Baja Municipio, PR.		
	Yabucoa Municipio, PR.		
42020	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	1.1598	1.1278
	San Luis Obispo County, CA.		
42044	Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA	1.1473	1.1178
	Orange County, CA.		
42060	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1.1091	1.0873
	Santa Barbara County, CA.		
42100	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	1.5457	1.4366
	Santa Cruz County, CA.		
42140	Santa Fe, NM	1.0824	1.0659
	Santa Fe County, NM.		
42220	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	1.4464	1.3571
	Sonoma County, CA.		
42260	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	0.9868	0.9894
	Manatee County, FL.		
	Sarasota County, FL.		
42340	Savannah, GA	0.9351	0.9481
	Bryan County, GA.		
	Chatham County, GA.		
	Effingham County, GA.		
42540	Scranton—Wilkes-Barre, PA	0.8347	0.8678
	Lackawanna County, PA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Luzerne County, PA.		
	Wyoming County, PA.		
42644	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	1.1434	1.1147
	King County, WA.		
	Snohomish County, WA.		
42680	Sebastian-Vero Beach, FL	0.9573	0.9658
	Indian River County, FL.		
43100	Sheboygan, WI	0.9026	0.9221
	Sheboygan County, WI.		
43300	Sherman-Denison, TX	0.8502	0.8802
	Grayson County, TX.		
43340	Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	0.8865	0.9092
	Bossier Parish, LA.		
	Caddo Parish, LA.		
	De Soto Parish, LA.		
43580	Sioux City, IA-NE-SD	0.9200	0.9360
	Woodbury County, IA.		
	Dakota County, NE.		
	Dixon County, NE.		
	Union County, SD.		
43620	Sioux Falls, SD	0.9559	0.9647
	Lincoln County, SD.		
	McCook County, SD.		
	Minnehaha County, SD.		
	Turner County, SD.		
43780	South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	0.9842	0.9874
	St. Joseph County, IN.		
	Cass County, MI.		
43900	Spartanburg, SC	0.9174	0.9339
	Spartanburg County, SC.		
44060	Spokane, WA	1.0447	1.0358
	Spokane County, WA.		
44100	Springfield, IL	0.8890	0.9112
	Menard County, IL.		
	Sangamon County, IL.		
44140	Springfield, MA	1.0079	1.0063
	Franklin County, MA.		
	Hampden County, MA.		
	Hampshire County, MA.		
44180	Springfield, MO	0.8469	0.8775
	Christian County, MO.		
	Dallas County, MO.		
	Greene County, MO.		
	Polk County, MO.		
	Webster County, MO.		
44220	Springfield, OH	0.8593	0.8874
	Clark County, OH.		
44300	State College, PA	0.8784	0.9027
	Centre County, PA.		
44700	Stockton, CA	1.1442	1.1154
	San Joaquin County, CA.		
44940	Sumter, SC	0.8083	0.8466
	Sumter County, SC.		
45060	Syracuse, NY	0.9691	0.9753
	Madison County, NY.		
	Onondaga County, NY.		
	Oswego County, NY.		
45104	Tacoma, WA	1.0789	1.0631
	Pierce County, WA.		
45220	Tallahassee, FL	0.8942	0.9154
	Gadsden County, FL.		
	Jefferson County, FL.		
	Leon County, FL.		
	Wakulla County, FL.		
45300	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	0.9144	0.9315
	Hernando County, FL.		
	Hillsborough County, FL.		
	Pasco County, FL.		
	Pinellas County, FL.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
45460	Terre Haute, IN	0.8765	0.9012
	Clay County, IN.		
	Sullivan County, IN.		
	Vermillion County, IN.		
	Vigo County, IN.		
45500	Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR	0.8104	0.8483
	Miller County, AR.		
	Bowie County, TX.		
45780	Toledo, OH	0.9586	0.9669
	Fulton County, OH.		
	Lucas County, OH.		
	Ottawa County, OH.		
	Wood County, OH.		
45820	Topeka, KS	0.8730	0.8984
	Jackson County, KS.		
	Jefferson County, KS.		
	Osage County, KS.		
	Shawnee County, KS.		
	Wabaunsee County, KS.		
45940	Trenton-Ewing, NJ	1.0835	1.0668
	Mercer County, NJ.		
46060	Tucson, AZ	0.9202	0.9362
	Pima County, AZ.		
46140	Tulsa, OK	0.8103	0.8482
	Creek County, OK.		
	Okmulgee County, OK.		
	Osage County, OK.		
	Pawnee County, OK.		
	Rogers County, OK.		
	Tulsa County, OK.		
	Wagoner County, OK.		
46220	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.8542	0.8834
	Greene County, AL.		
	Hale County, AL.		
	Tuscaloosa County, AL.		
46340	Tyler, TX	0.8811	0.9049
	Smith County, TX.		
46540	Utica-Rome, NY	0.8396	0.8717
	Herkimer County, NY.		
	Oneida County, NY.		
46660	Valdosta, GA	0.8369	0.8695
	Brooks County, GA.		
	Echols County, GA.		
	Lanier County, GA.		
	Lowndes County, GA.		
46700	Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	1.5137	1.4110
	Solano County, CA.		
47020	Victoria, TX	0.8560	0.8848
	Calhoun County, TX.		
	Goliad County, TX.		
	Victoria County, TX.		
47220	Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	0.9832	0.9866
	Cumberland County, NJ.		
47260	Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	0.8790	0.9032
	Currituck County, NC.		
	Gloucester County, VA.		
	Isle of Wight County, VA.		
	James City County, VA.		
	Mathews County, VA.		
	Surry County, VA.		
	York County, VA.		
	Chesapeake City, VA.		
	Hampton City, VA.		
	Newport News City, VA.		
	Norfolk City, VA.		
	Poquoson City, VA.		
	Portsmouth City, VA.		
	Suffolk City, VA.		
	Virginia Beach City, VA.		

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Williamsburg City, VA.		
47300	Visalia-Porterville, CA	0.9968	0.9974
	Tulare County, CA.		
47380	Waco, TX	0.8633	0.8906
	McLennan County, TX.		
47580	Warner Robins, GA	0.8380	0.8704
	Houston County, GA.		
47644	Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI	1.0054	1.0043
	Lapeer County, MI.		
	Livingston County, MI.		
	Macomb County, MI.		
	Oakland County, MI.		
	St. Clair County, MI.		
47894	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	1.1054	1.0843
	District of Columbia, DC.		
	Calvert County, MD.		
	Charles County, MD.		
	Prince George's County, MD.		
	Arlington County, VA.		
	Clarke County, VA.		
	Fairfax County, VA.		
	Fauquier County, VA.		
	Loudoun County, VA.		
	Prince William County, VA.		
	Spotsylvania County, VA.		
	Stafford County, VA.		
	Warren County, VA.		
	Alexandria City, VA.		
	Fairfax City, VA.		
	Falls Church City, VA.		
	Fredericksburg City, VA.		
	Manassas City, VA.		
	Manassas Park City, VA.		
	Jefferson County, WV.		
47940	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	0.8408	0.8726
	Black Hawk County, IA.		
	Bremer County, IA.		
	Grundy County, IA.		
48140	Wausau, WI	0.9722	0.9778
	Marathon County, WI.		
48260	Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	0.8063	0.8450
	Jefferson County, OH.		
	Brooke County, WV.		
	Hancock County, WV.		
48300	Wenatchee, WA	1.0346	1.0277
	Chelan County, WA.		
	Douglas County, WA.		
48424	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach, FL	0.9649	0.9719
	Palm Beach County, FL.		
48540	Wheeling, WV-OH	0.7010	0.7608
	Belmont County, OH.		
	Marshall County, WV.		
	Ohio County, WV.		
48620	Wichita, KS	0.9063	0.9250
	Butler County, KS.		
	Harvey County, KS.		
	Sedgwick County, KS.		
	Sumner County, KS.		
48660	Wichita Falls, TX	0.8311	0.8649
	Archer County, TX.		
	Clay County, TX.		
	Wichita County, TX.		
48700	Williamsport, PA	0.8139	0.8511
	Lycoming County, PA.		
48864	Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ	1.0684	1.0547
	New Castle County, DE.		
	Cecil County, MD.		
	Salem County, NJ.		
48900	Wilmington, NC	0.9835	0.9868

TABLE 1.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Urban area (constituent counties)	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
	Brunswick County, NC.		
	New Hanover County, NC.		
	Pender County, NC.		
49020	Winchester, VA-WV	1.0091	1.0073
	Frederick County, VA.		
	Winchester City, VA.		
	Hampshire County, WV.		
49180	Winston-Salem, NC	0.9276	0.9421
	Davie County, NC.		
	Forsyth County, NC.		
	Stokes County, NC.		
	Yadkin County, NC.		
49340	Worcester, MA	1.0722	1.0578
	Worcester County, MA.		
49420	Yakima, WA	0.9847	0.9878
	Yakima County, WA.		
49500	Yauco, PR	0.3854	0.5083
	Guánica Municipio, PR.		
	Guayanilla Municipio, PR.		
	Peñuelas Municipio, PR.		
	Yauco Municipio, PR.		
49620	York-Hanover, PA	0.9397	0.9518
	York County, PA.		
49660	Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	0.8802	0.9042
	Mahoning County, OH.		
	Trumbull County, OH.		
	Mercer County, PA.		
49700	Yuba City, CA	1.0730	1.0584
	Sutter County, CA.		
	Yuba County, CA.		
49740	Yuma, AZ	0.9109	0.9287
	Yuma County, AZ.		

[1] As discussed in section IV.D.1.d. of the preamble of this final rule, because there will no longer be any LTCHs in their cost reporting periods that began during FYs 2003, 2004 or 2005 (the first 3 years of the 5-year wage index phase-in, respectively), we are no longer showing the 1/5th, 2/5ths and 3/5ths wage index value. For further details on the 5-year phase-in of the wage index, see section IV.D.1.of this final rule.

[2] The wage index values are calculated using the same wage data used to compute the wage index used by acute care hospitals under the IPPS for Federal FY 2007 (that is, fiscal year 2003 audited acute care hospital inpatient wage data without regard to reclassification under section 1886(d)(8) or section 1886(d)(10) of the Act).

[3] Four-fifths of the full wage index value, applicable for a LTCH's cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 (Federal FY 2006). That is, for a LTCH's cost reporting period that begins during Federal FY 2006 and located in Chicago, Illinois (CBSA 16974), the 4/5ths wage index value is computed as ((4*1.0751) + 1))/5 = 1.0601. For further details on the 5-year phase-in of the wage index, see section IV.D.1. of this final rule.

TABLE 2.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]

CBSA code	Nonurban area	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
01	Alabama	0.7591	0.8073
02	Alaska	1.0661	1.0529
03	Arizona	0.8908	0.9126
04	Arkansas	0.7307	0.7846
05	California	1.1454	1.1163
06	Colorado	0.9325	0.9460
07	Connecticut	1.1709	1.1367
08	Delaware	0.9705	0.9764
10	Florida	0.8594	0.8875
11	Georgia	0.7593	0.8074
12	Hawaii	1.0448	1.0358
13	Idaho	0.8120	0.8496
14	Illinois	0.8320	0.8656
15	Indiana	0.8538	0.8830
16	Iowa	0.8681	0.8945
17	Kansas	0.7998	0.8398
18	Kentucky	0.7768	0.8214
19	Louisiana	0.7438	0.7950
20	Maine	0.8443	0.8754

TABLE 2.—LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS FOR DISCHARGES OCCURRING FROM JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2008 [1]—Continued

CBSA code	Nonurban area	Full wage index [2]	4/5ths wage index [3]
21	Maryland	0.8926	0.9141
22	Massachusetts [4]	.....	.....
23	Michigan	0.9062	0.9250
24	Minnesota	0.9153	0.9322
25	Mississippi	0.7738	0.8190
26	Missouri	0.7927	0.8342
27	Montana	0.8590	0.8872
28	Nebraska	0.8677	0.8942
29	Nevada	0.8944	0.9155
30	New Hampshire	1.0853	1.0682
31	New Jersey [4]	.....	.....
32	New Mexico	0.8332	0.8666
33	New York	0.8232	0.8586
34	North Carolina	0.8588	0.8870
35	North Dakota	0.7215	0.7772
36	Ohio	0.8658	0.8926
37	Oklahoma	0.7629	0.8103
38	Oregon	0.9753	0.9802
39	Pennsylvania	0.8320	0.8656
40	Puerto Rico [4]	.....	.....
41	Rhode Island [4]	.....	.....
42	South Carolina	0.8566	0.8853
43	South Dakota	0.8480	0.8784
44	Tennessee	0.7827	0.8262
45	Texas	0.7965	0.8372
46	Utah	0.8140	0.8512
47	Vermont	0.9744	0.9795
49	Virginia	0.7940	0.8352
50	Washington	1.0263	1.0210
51	West Virginia	0.7607	0.8086
52	Wisconsin	0.9553	0.9642
53	Wyoming	0.9295	0.9436

[1] As discussed in section IV.D.1.d. of the preamble of this final rule, because there are no longer any LTCHs in their cost reporting periods that began during FYs 2003, 2004 or 2005 (the first 3 years of the 5-year wage index phase-in, respectively), we are no longer showing the 1/5th, 2/5ths and 3/5ths wage index value. For further details on the 5-year phase-in of the wage index, see section IV.D.1. of this final rule.

[2] The wage index values are calculated using the same wage data used to compute the wage index used by acute care hospitals under the IPPS for Federal FY 2007 (that is, fiscal year 2003 audited acute care hospital inpatient wage data without regard to reclassification under section 1886(d)(8) or section 1886(d)(10) of the Act).

[3] Four-fifths of the full wage index value, applicable for a LTCH's cost reporting period beginning on or after October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 (Federal FY 2006). That is, for a LTCH's cost reporting period that begins during Federal FY 2006 and located in rural Illinois, the 4/5ths wage index value is computed as ((4*0.8320) + 1))/5 = 0.8656. For further details on the 5-year phase-in of the wage index, see section IV.D.1. of this final rule.

[4] All counties within the State are classified as urban.

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
1	[5] CRANIOTOMY AGE >17 W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	16.1
2	[6] CRANIOTOMY AGE >17 W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	7.1
3	[6] CRANIOTOMY AGE 0–17	1.6835	37.1	30.9	20.1
6	[6] CARPAL TUNNEL RELEASE	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
7	PERIPH & CRANIAL NERVE & OTHER NERV SYST PROC W CC	1.2052	36.1	30.1	15.8
8	[2] PERIPH & CRANIAL NERVE & OTHER NERV SYST PROC W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.2
9	SPINAL DISORDERS & INJURIES	1.0424	34.0	28.3	9.7
10	NERVOUS SYSTEM NEOPLASMS W CC	0.6971	22.1	18.4	9.6
11	[2] NERVOUS SYSTEM NEOPLASMS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.7
12	DEGENERATIVE NERVOUS SYSTEM DISORDERS	0.6788	25.1	20.9	8.4
13	MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS & CEREBELLAR ATAXIA	0.6003	23.1	19.3	7.4
14	INTRACRANIAL HEMORRHAGE OR CEREBRAL INFARCTION	0.6772	24.9	20.8	8.6
15	NONSPECIFIC CVA & PRECEREBRAL OCCLUSION W/O INFARCT	0.7705	26.1	21.8	6.4
16	NONSPECIFIC CEREBROVASCULAR DISORDERS W CC	0.6978	23.1	19.3	10.1
17	[2] NONSPECIFIC CEREBROVASCULAR DISORDERS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.7

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
18	CRANIAL & PERIPHERAL NERVE DISORDERS W CC	0.7503	25.4	21.2	8.2
19	CRANIAL & PERIPHERAL NERVE DISORDERS W/O CC	0.4512	19.5	16.3	5.3
21	[3] VIRAL MENINGITIS	0.7819	23.9	19.9	9.9
22	[3] HYPERTENSIVE ENCEPHALOPATHY	0.7819	23.9	19.9	7.9
23	NONTRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA	1.0118	29.4	24.5	6.1
26	[6] SEIZURE & HEADACHE AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.2
27	TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA >1 HR	0.9978	30.6	25.5	7.6
28	TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE >17 W CC	0.7983	25.8	21.5	9.1
29	[1] TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.0
30**	[6] TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.0
31	[1] CONCUSSION AGE >17 W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.2
32	[6] CONCUSSION AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.4
33**	[6] CONCUSSION AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	1.6
34	OTHER DISORDERS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM W CC	0.7029	23.4	19.5	7.4
35	OTHER DISORDERS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM W/O CC	0.5080	21.1	17.6	4.7
36	[6] RETINAL PROCEDURES	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.7
37	[6] ORBITAL PROCEDURES	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.6
38	[6] PRIMARY IRIS PROCEDURES	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.3
39	[6] LENS PROCEDURES WITH OR WITHOUT VITRECTOMY	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.1
40	[6] EXTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT ORBIT AGE >17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.7
41**	[6] EXTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT ORBIT AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	1.6
42	[6] INTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT RETINA, IRIS & LENS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.7
43	[6] HYPHEMA	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.6
44	[3] ACUTE MAJOR EYE INFECTIONS	0.7819	23.9	19.9	7.4
45	[1] NEUROLOGICAL EYE DISORDERS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.6
46	[2] OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE >17 W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.6
47	[6] OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.7
48**	[6] OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.9
49	[6] MAJOR HEAD & NECK PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.1
50	[6] SIALOADENECTOMY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.6
51	[6] SALIVARY GLAND PROCEDURES EXCEPT SIALOADENECTOMY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.0
52	[6] CLEFT LIP & PALATE REPAIR	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.1
53	[6] SINUS & MASTOID PROCEDURES AGE >17	1.1625	29.5	24.6	6.2
54**	[6] SINUS & MASTOID PROCEDURES AGE 0–17	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.2
55	[4] MISCELLANEOUS EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.3
56	[6] RHINOPLASTY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.1
57	[6] T&A PROC, EXCEPT TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE >17.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.9
58**	[6] T&A PROC, EXCEPT TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE 0–17.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	1.5
59	[6] TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE >17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.6
60	[6] TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.7
61	[6] MYRINGOTOMY W TUBE INSERTION AGE >17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	10.2
62	[6] MYRINGOTOMY W TUBE INSERTION AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.3
63	[4] OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT O.R. PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.2
64	EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT MALIGNANCY	1.1797	26.2	21.8	10.2
65	[1] DYSEQUILIBRIUM	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.2
66	[6] EPISTAXIS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
67	[3] EPIGLOTTITIS	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.8
68	OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE &>17 W CC	0.6211	20.3	16.9	5.9
69	[1] OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE &>17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.5
70	[6] OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.6
71	[6] LARYNGOTRACHEITIS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.7
72	[3] NASAL TRAUMA & DEFORMITY	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.2
73	OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT DIAGNOSES AGE >17	0.7745	22.9	19.1	6.9
74	[6] OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT DIAGNOSES AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.9
75	MAJOR CHEST PROCEDURES	1.9944	33.5	27.9	15.4
76	OTHER RESP SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W CC	2.3982	42.5	35.4	17.2
77	[2] OTHER RESP SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	7.4
78	PULMONARY EMBOLISM	0.6746	22.6	18.8	9.4
79	RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE >17 W CC	0.8182	22.8	19.0	12.9
80	RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.6485	20.9	17.4	8.3
81	[6] RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	10.1
82	RESPIRATORY NEOPLASMS	0.8242	21.4	17.8	11.0

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
83	[1] MAJOR CHEST TRAUMA W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	8.2
84	[6] MAJOR CHEST TRAUMA W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
85	PLEURAL EFFUSION W CC	0.6956	21.4	17.8	9.9
86	[6] PLEURAL EFFUSION W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.5
87	PULMONARY EDEMA & RESPIRATORY FAILURE	1.0295	24.8	20.7	10.3
88	CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE	0.6411	19.3	16.1	7.5
89	SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE >17 W CC	0.6802	20.6	17.2	8.6
90	SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4958	17.8	14.8	5.6
91	[6] SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.3
92	INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE W CC	0.6638	19.6	16.3	9.4
93	[1] INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.9
94	PNEUMOTHORAX W CC	0.6785	21.3	17.8	9.6
95	[8] PNEUMOTHORAX W/O CC	0.6785	21.3	17.8	5.3
96	BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE >17 W CC	0.6230	18.9	15.8	6.7
97	[8] BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE >17 W/O CC	0.6230	18.9	15.8	5.2
98	[6] BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.4
99	RESPIRATORY SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W CC	0.9381	24.6	20.5	4.8
100	3RESPIRATORY SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.1
101	OTHER RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W CC	0.8147	22.2	18.5	6.7
102	[1] OTHER RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.9
103***	[7] HEART TRANSPLANT OR IMPLANT OF HEART ASSIST SYSTEM	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
104	[6] CARDIAC VALVE & OTHER MAJOR CARDIOTHORACIC PROC W CARDIAC CATH.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	22.3
105	[6] CARDIAC VALVE & OTHER MAJOR CARDIOTHORACIC PROC W/O CARDIAC CATH.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	15.0
106	[6] CORONARY BYPASS W PTCA	1.1625	29.5	24.6	16.6
108	[6] OTHER CARDIOTHORACIC PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	17.1
110	[4] MAJOR CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	13.8
111	[6] MAJOR CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.9
113	AMPUTATION FOR CIRC SYSTEM DISORDERS EXCEPT UPPER LIMB & TOE	1.3942	36.1	30.1	20.5
114	UPPER LIMB & TOE AMPUTATION FOR CIRC SYSTEM DISORDERS	1.2425	33.0	27.5	14.0
117	[2] CARDIAC PACEMAKER REVISION EXCEPT DEVICE REPLACEMENT	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.7
118	[3] CARDIAC PACEMAKER DEVICE REPLACEMENT	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.6
119	[3] VEIN LIGATION & STRIPPING	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.8
120	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES	1.0893	31.4	26.2	15.5
121	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI & MAJOR COMP, DISCHARGED ALIVE	0.7451	22.4	18.7	10.1
122	[2] CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI W/O MAJOR COMP, DISCHARGED ALIVE.	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.3
123	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI, EXPIRED	0.7858	17.0	14.2	7.6
124	[4] CIRCULATORY DISORDERS EXCEPT AMI, W CARD CATH & COMPLEX DIAG.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.0
125	[1] CIRCULATORY DISORDERS EXCEPT AMI, W CARD CATH W/O COMPLEX DIAG.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.1
126	ACUTE & SUBACUTE ENDOCARDITIS	0.8867	26.3	21.9	17.5
127	HEART FAILURE & SHOCK	0.6832	21.2	17.7	8.0
128	[2] DEEP VEIN THROMBOPHLEBITIS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	8.0
129	[1] CARDIAC ARREST, UNEXPLAINED	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.5
130	PERIPHERAL VASCULAR DISORDERS W CC	0.6484	22.8	19.0	8.6
131	PERIPHERAL VASCULAR DISORDERS W/O CC	0.5267	21.0	17.5	5.9
132	ATHEROSCLEROSIS W CC	0.6621	20.7	17.3	4.3
133	[2] ATHEROSCLEROSIS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.2
134	HYPERTENSION	0.4909	21.7	18.1	4.8
135	CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC	0.8014	23.8	19.8	6.8
136	[1] CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.1
137**	[6] CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.3
138	CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIA & CONDUCTION DISORDERS W CC	0.6618	21.9	18.3	6.1
139	[2] CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIA & CONDUCTION DISORDERS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.7
140	[1] ANGINA PECTORIS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.6
141	SYNCOPE & COLLAPSE W CC	0.5891	22.1	18.4	5.3
142	[8] SYNCOPE & COLLAPSE W/O CC	0.5891	22.1	18.4	3.8
143	[1] CHEST PAIN	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.1
144	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W CC	0.7715	22.1	18.4	9.6
145	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W/O CC	0.4292	17.0	14.2	3.9
146	[5] RECTAL RESECTION W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	14.6

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
147	[6] RECTAL RESECTION W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.5
149	[6] MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.1
150	[5] PERITONEAL ADHESIOLYSIS W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	17.3
151	[6] PERITONEAL ADHESIOLYSIS W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	8.2
152	[5] MINOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	12.0
153	[6] MINOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	7.1
155	[6] STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES AGE >17 W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	6.4
156	[6] STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES AGE 0–17	1.6835	37.1	30.9	12.1
157	[3] ANAL & STOMAL PROCEDURES W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	9.3
158	[6] ANAL & STOMAL PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.1
159	[5] HERNIA PROCEDURES EXCEPT INGUINAL & FEMORAL AGE >17 W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	8.2
160	[1] HERNIA PROCEDURES EXCEPT INGUINAL & FEMORAL AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.1
161	[6] INGUINAL & FEMORAL HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE >17 W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	7.3
162	[6] INGUINAL & FEMORAL HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.1
163	[6] HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.0
164	[6] APPENDECTOMY W COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	11.9
165	[6] APPENDECTOMY W COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.1
166	[6] APPENDECTOMY W/O COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.8
167	[6] APPENDECTOMY W/O COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.1
168	[5] MOUTH PROCEDURES W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	7.7
169	[6] MOUTH PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.5
170	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W CC	1.6163	35.8	29.8	18.0
171	[3] OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.7
172	DIGESTIVE MALIGNANCY W CC	0.8497	21.8	18.2	11.1
173	[2] DIGESTIVE MALIGNANCY W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.6
174	G.I. HEMORRHAGE W CC	0.7149	22.9	19.1	7.2
175	[2] G.I. HEMORRHAGE W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.3
176	COMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER	0.9514	24.8	20.7	8.0
177	[2] UNCOMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.8
178	[6] UNCOMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.7
179	INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE	0.8157	23.3	19.4	9.1
180	G.I. OBSTRUCTION W CC	0.9126	22.8	19.0	8.3
181	[1] G.I. OBSTRUCTION W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.1
182	ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC	0.7866	21.8	18.2	6.4
183	[1] ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.4
184	[6] ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.6
185	DENTAL & ORAL DIS EXCEPT EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS, AGE >17	0.6634	23.2	19.3	7.2
186	[6] DENTAL & ORAL DIS EXCEPT EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS, AGE 0–17.	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.0
187	[6] DENTAL EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.8
188	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W CC	0.9596	24.4	20.3	8.5
189	[2] OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.6
190	[6] OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.1
191	[5] PANCREAS, LIVER & SHUNT PROCEDURES W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	21.1
192	[6] PANCREAS, LIVER & SHUNT PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	9.3
193	[4] BILIARY TRACT PROC EXCEPT ONLY CHOLECYST W OR W/O C.D.E. W CC.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	19.7
194	[6] BILIARY TRACT PROC EXCEPT ONLY CHOLECYST W OR W/O C.D.E. W/O CC.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.9
195	[5] CHOLECYSTECTOMY W C.D.E. W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	16.2
196	[6] CHOLECYSTECTOMY W C.D.E. W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	8.3
197	[4] CHOLECYSTECTOMY EXCEPT BY LAPAROSCOPE W/O C.D.E. W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	14.0
198	[6] CHOLECYSTECTOMY EXCEPT BY LAPAROSCOPE W/O C.D.E. W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	6.6
199	[3] HEPATOBILIARY DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURE FOR MALIGNANCY	0.7819	23.9	19.9	15.2
200	[5] HEPATOBILIARY DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURE FOR NON-MALIGNANCY	1.6835	37.1	30.9	17.5
201	OTHER HEPATOBILIARY OR PANCREAS O.R. PROCEDURES	1.5802	28.8	24.0	22.6
202	CIRRHOSIS & ALCOHOLIC HEPATITIS	0.6011	20.2	16.8	9.9
203	MALIGNANCY OF HEPATOBILIARY SYSTEM OR PANCREAS	0.7466	19.6	16.3	10.6
204	DISORDERS OF PANCREAS EXCEPT MALIGNANCY	0.8853	22.1	18.4	8.5
205	DISORDERS OF LIVER EXCEPT MALIG,CIRR,ALC HEPA W CC	0.6933	23.1	19.3	9.4
206	[8] DISORDERS OF LIVER EXCEPT MALIG,CIRR,ALC HEPA W/O CC	0.6933	23.1	19.3	6.0
207	DISORDERS OF THE BILIARY TRACT W CC	0.7295	21.5	17.9	8.4
208	[1] DISORDERS OF THE BILIARY TRACT W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.6

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
210	HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE >17 W CC	1.4826	41.9	34.9	9.5
211	[6] HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE >17 W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	6.3
212	[6] HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE 0–17	1.6835	37.1	30.9	3.8
213	AMPUTATION FOR MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONN TISSUE DISORDERS.	1.1871	33.5	27.9	15.2
216	BIOPSIES OF MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE	1.2147	37.6	31.3	8.8
217	WND DEBRID & SKN GRFT EXCEPT HAND,FOR MUSCSKELET & CONN TISS DIS.	1.2414	36.5	30.4	20.4
218	[5] LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP,FOOT,FEMUR AGE >17 W CC.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	8.4
219	[6] LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP,FOOT,FEMUR AGE >17 W/O CC.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	4.8
220	[6] LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP,FOOT,FEMUR AGE 0–17	1.6835	37.1	30.9	10.5
223	[4] MAJOR SHOULDER/ELBOW PROC, OR OTHER UPPER EXTREMITY PROC W CC.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.1
224	[1] SHOULDER,ELBOW OR FOREARM PROC,EXC MAJOR JOINT PROC, W/O CC.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.8
225	FOOT PROCEDURES	0.9550	30.6	25.5	8.7
226	SOFT TISSUE PROCEDURES W CC	1.0626	34.3	28.6	10.6
227	[3] SOFT TISSUE PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.0
228	[3] MAJOR THUMB OR JOINT PROC,OR OTH HAND OR WRIST PROC W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.7
229	[6] HAND OR WRIST PROC, EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT PROC, W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.8
230	[5] LOCAL EXCISION & REMOVAL OF INT FIX DEVICES OF HIP & FEMUR	1.6835	37.1	30.9	8.8
232	[5] ARTHROSCOPY	1.6835	37.1	30.9	4.1
233	OTHER MUSCULOSKELET SYS & CONN TISS O.R. PROC W CC	1.1724	32.4	27.0	10.8
234	[6] OTHER MUSCULOSKELET SYS & CONN TISS O.R. PROC W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.1
235	[3] FRACTURES OF FEMUR	0.7819	23.9	19.9	7.4
236	FRACTURES OF HIP & PELVIS	0.6802	28.9	24.1	6.8
237	[1] SPRAINS, STRAINS, & DISLOCATIONS OF HIP, PELVIS & THIGH	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.9
238	OSTEOMYELITIS	0.8589	28.4	23.7	12.8
239	PATHOLOGICAL FRACTURES & MUSCULOSKELETAL & CONN TISS MALIGNANCY.	0.6031	20.6	17.2	9.6
240	CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISORDERS W CC	0.7134	22.4	18.7	10.3
241	[1] CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISORDERS W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.6
242	SEPTIC ARTHRITIS	0.7700	26.2	21.8	10.2
243	MEDICAL BACK PROBLEMS	0.6028	22.3	18.6	7.1
244	BONE DISEASES & SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES W CC	0.5516	22.0	18.3	7.0
245	BONE DISEASES & SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES W/O CC	0.4463	19.4	16.2	4.8
246	[2] NON-SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.6
247	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS OF MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONN TISSUE	0.4582	17.6	14.7	5.1
248	TENDONITIS, MYOSITIS & BURSITIS	0.7328	23.2	19.3	7.5
249	AFTERCARE, MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE	0.6370	24.0	20.0	6.2
250	[1] FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE >17 W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.0
251	[6] FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.3
252**	[6] FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	1.8
253	FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM,LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE >17 W CC	0.5609	24.0	20.0	7.0
254	[1] FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM,LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.7
255**	[6] FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM,LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.9
256	OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE DIAGNOSES	0.7132	23.6	19.7	7.9
257	[5] TOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	3.8
258	[6] TOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	2.4
259	[3] SUBTOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.1
260	[6] SUBTOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	1.9
261	[2] BREAST PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY EXCEPT BIOPSY & LOCAL EXCISION.	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.2
262	[4] BREAST BIOPSY & LOCAL EXCISION FOR NON-MALIGNANCY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.7
263	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID FOR SKN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W CC	1.2748	38.0	31.7	16.9
264	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID FOR SKN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W/O CC	0.8507	29.9	24.9	9.9
265	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID EXCEPT FOR SKIN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W CC.	1.1019	30.2	25.2	10.7
266	[3] SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID EXCEPT FOR SKIN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W/O CC.	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.7
267	[6] PERIANAL & PILONIDAL PROCEDURES	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.8
268	[4] SKIN, SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE & BREAST PLASTIC PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.4

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
269	OTHER SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST PROC W CC	1.2075	34.7	28.9	13.4
270	[3] OTHER SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST PROC W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.7
271	SKIN ULCERS	0.8269	26.9	22.4	10.7
272	MAJOR SKIN DISORDERS W CC	0.6584	23.0	19.2	9.3
273	[1] MAJOR SKIN DISORDERS W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.9
274	MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS W CC	0.7231	21.8	18.2	10.1
275	[6] MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.2
276	[2] NON-MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	7.3
277	CELLULITIS AGE >17 W CC	0.6089	20.9	17.4	8.4
278	CELLULITIS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4254	18.0	15.0	6.1
279	[6] CELLULITIS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.8
280	TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE >17 W CC	0.7148	24.1	20.1	6.3
281	[2] TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.3
282**	[6] TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.2
283	MINOR SKIN DISORDERS W CC	0.6876	23.1	19.3	7.2
284	[2] MINOR SKIN DISORDERS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.6
285	AMPUTAT OF LOWER LIMB FOR ENDOCRINE,NUTRIT,& METABOL DISORDERS.	1.2418	31.6	26.3	16.0
286	[6] ADRENAL & PITUITARY PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	8.0
287	SKIN GRAFTS & WOUND DEBRID FOR ENDOC, NUTRIT & METAB DISORDERS.	1.0402	33.0	27.5	15.2
288	[4] O.R. PROCEDURES FOR OBESITY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.4
289	[6] PARATHYROID PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.3
290	[6] THYROID PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.8
291	[6] THYROGLOSSAL PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.1
292	OTHER ENDOCRINE, NUTRIT & METAB O.R. PROC W CC	1.1549	32.0	26.7	16.9
293	[8] OTHER ENDOCRINE, NUTRIT & METAB O.R. PROC W/O CC	1.1549	32.0	26.7	7.8
294	DIABETES AGE >35	0.6958	23.9	19.9	6.7
295	[2] DIABETES AGE 0–35	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.7
296	NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC	0.7092	22.3	18.6	7.3
297	NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4596	19.3	16.1	4.6
298	[6] NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.3
299	[3] INBORN ERRORS OF METABOLISM	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.2
300	ENDOCRINE DISORDERS W CC	0.7004	23.7	19.8	9.3
301	[2] ENDOCRINE DISORDERS W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.2
302***	[7] KIDNEY TRANSPLANT	0.0000	0.0	0.00.0	
303	[6] KIDNEY AND URETER PROCEDURES FOR NEOPLASM	0.7819	23.9	19.9	9.7
304	[4] KIDNEY AND URETER PROCEDURES FOR NON-NEOPLASM W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	13.4
305	[6] KIDNEY AND URETER PROCEDURES FOR NON-NEOPLASM W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.7
306	[4] PROSTATECTOMY W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.1
307	[6] PROSTATECTOMY W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.9
308	[4] MINOR BLADDER PROCEDURES W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	8.6
309	[6] MINOR BLADDER PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.4
310	[4] TRANSURETHRAL PROCEDURES W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.2
311	[6] TRANSURETHRAL PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.7
312	[3] URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE >17 W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.0
313	[6] URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE >17 W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.6
314	[6] URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	360.4
315	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT PROCEDURES	1.4016	33.9	28.3	11.1
316	RENAL FAILURE	0.8321	22.9	19.1	9.9
317	ADMIT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS	0.9102	24.4	20.3	5.4
318	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT NEOPLASMS W CC	0.7565	21.0	17.5	9.8
319	[6] KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT NEOPLASMS W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.9
320	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE >17 W CC	0.6200	21.7	18.1	7.7
321	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4450	18.5	15.4	5.4
322	[6] KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.2
323	[1] URINARY STONES W CC, &/OR ESW LITHOTRIPSY	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
324	[1] URINARY STONES W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.7
325	[2] KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE >17 W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.8
326	[6] KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.9
327	[6] KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.8
328	[6] URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE >17 W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.4
329	[6] URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.4
330**	[6] URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	1.6

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
331	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W CC	0.7773	22.5	18.8	8.7
332	[1] OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
333	[6] OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	8.4
334	[6] MAJOR MALE PELVIC PROCEDURES W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.1
335	[1] MAJOR MALE PELVIC PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.7
336	[4] TRANSURETHRAL PROSTATECTOMY W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.9
337	[6] TRANSURETHRAL PROSTATECTOMY W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.6
338	[3] TESTES PROCEDURES, FOR MALIGNANCY	0.7819	23.9	19.9	9.7
339	[3] TESTES PROCEDURES, NON-MALIGNANCY AGE >17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.4
340**	[6] TESTES PROCEDURES, NON-MALIGNANCY AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	2.4
341	[5] PENIS PROCEDURES	1.6835	37.1	30.9	4.4
342	[6] CIRCUMCISION AGE >17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.6
343**	[6] CIRCUMCISION AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	1.7
344	[3] OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES FOR MALIGNANCY.	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.9
345	[4] OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROC EXCEPT FOR MALIGNANCY.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	8.6
346	[3] MALIGNANCY, MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM, W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	9.6
347	[1] MALIGNANCY, MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM, W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.2
348	[2] BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERTROPHY W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.3
349	[6] BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERTROPHY W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.1
350	INFLAMMATION OF THE MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM	0.5606	21.0	17.5	7.0
351**	[6] STERILIZATION, MALE	0.7819	23.9	19.9	1.3
352	OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES	0.8209	27.5	22.9	6.7
353	[6] PELVIC EVISCERATION, RADICAL HYSTERECTOMY & RADICAL VULVECTOMY.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.2
354	[6] UTERINE,ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-OVARIAN/ADNEXAL MALIG W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	8.2
355	[6] UTERINE,ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-OVARIAN/ADNEXAL MALIG W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.2
356	[6] FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTIVE PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.7
357	[6] UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR OVARIAN OR ADNEXAL MALIGNANCY	1.1625	29.5	24.6	12.3
358	[6] UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.7
359	[6] UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.3
360	[6] VAGINA, CERVIX & VULVA PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.7
361	[6] LAPAROSCOPY & INCISIONAL TUBAL INTERRUPTION	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.5
362	[6] ENDOSCOPIC TUBAL INTERRUPTION	0.4175	17.0	14.2	1.0
363	[6] D&C, CONIZATION & RADIO-IMPLANT, FOR MALIGNANCY	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.5
364	[6] D&C, CONIZATION EXCEPT FOR MALIGNANCY	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.1
365	[4] OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES	1.1625	29.5	24.6	13.0
366	MALIGNANCY, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM W CC	0.9106	21.6	18.0	10.2
367	[1] MALIGNANCY, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.6
368	INFECTIONS, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM	0.7846	21.3	17.8	10.2
369	[3] MENSTRUAL & OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DISORDERS	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.1
370	[6] CESAREAN SECTION W CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	7.0
371	[6] CESAREAN SECTION W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.5
372	[6] VAGINAL DELIVERY W COMPLICATING DIAGNOSES	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.7
373	[6] VAGINAL DELIVERY W/O COMPLICATING DIAGNOSES	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.0
374	[6] VAGINAL DELIVERY W STERILIZATION &/OR D&C	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.1
375	[6] VAGINAL DELIVERY W O.R. PROC EXCEPT STERIL &/OR D&C	0.4175	17.0	14.2	11.0
376	[4] POSTPARTUM & POST ABORTION DIAGNOSES W/O O.R. PROCEDURE	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.1
377	[6] POSTPARTUM & POST ABORTION DIAGNOSES W O.R. PROCEDURE	0.4175	17.0	14.2	7.2
378	[6] ECTOPIC PREGNANCY	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.2
379	[6] THREATENED ABORTION	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.8
380	[6] ABORTION W/O D&C	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.9
381	[6] ABORTION W D&C, ASPIRATION CURETTAGE OR HYSTEROTOMY	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.6
382	[6] FALSE LABOR	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.1
383	[1] OTHER ANTEPARTUM DIAGNOSES W MEDICAL COMPLICATIONS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.6
384	[6] OTHER ANTEPARTUM DIAGNOSES W/O MEDICAL COMPLICATIONS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.6
385**	[6] NEONATES, DIED OR TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER ACUTE CARE FACILITY.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	1.8
386**	[6] EXTREME IMMATURITY OR RESPIRATORY DISTRESS SYNDROME, NEONATE.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	17.9
387**	[6] PREMATURITY W MAJOR PROBLEMS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	13.3
388**	[6] PREMATURITY W/O MAJOR PROBLEMS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	8.6
389	[6] FULL TERM NEONATE W MAJOR PROBLEMS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	17.6

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
390**	[6] NEONATE W OTHER SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.4
391**	[6] NORMAL NEWBORN	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.1
392	[6] SPLENECTOMY AGE >17	1.1625	29.5	24.6	14.5
393**	[6] SPLENECTOMY AGE 0–17	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.1
394	[4] OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES OF THE BLOOD AND BLOOD FORMING ORGANS.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	12.1
395	RED BLOOD CELL DISORDERS AGE >17	0.6651	21.9	18.3	6.5
396	[6] RED BLOOD CELL DISORDERS AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.5
397	COAGULATION DISORDERS	0.8276	20.4	17.0	8.2
398	RETICULOENDOTHELIAL & IMMUNITY DISORDERS W CC	0.6278	20.8	17.3	8.8
399	[1] RETICULOENDOTHELIAL & IMMUNITY DISORDERS W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.1
401	[4] LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W OTHER O.R. PROC W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	18.9
402	[6] LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W OTHER O.R. PROC W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.3
403	LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W CC	0.8846	23.9	19.9	13.2
404	[3] LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.6
405**	[6] ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.9
406	[5] MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W MAJ O.R.PROC W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	15.5
407	[6] MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W MAJ O.R.PROC W/O CC.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.5
408	[4] MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W OTHER O.R.PROC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	14.0
409	RADIOTHERAPY	0.8416	23.2	19.3	9.5
410	CHEMOTHERAPY W/O ACUTE LEUKEMIA AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS	1.2527	28.7	23.9	5.8
411	[6] HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY W/O ENDOSCOPY	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.3
412	[6] HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY W ENDOSCOPY	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.1
413	OTHER MYELOPROLIF DIS OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL DIAG W CC	0.8429	21.4	17.8	11.0
414	[3] OTHER MYELOPROLIF DIS OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL DIAG W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.4
417	[6] SEPTICEMIA AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	10.5
418	POSTOPERATIVE & POST-TRAUMATIC INFECTIONS	0.7961	24.1	20.1	9.6
419	[2] FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE >17 W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	6.8
420	[2] FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.9
421	VIRAL ILLNESS AGE >17	0.7065	20.4	17.0	6.2
422	[6] VIRAL ILLNESS & FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE 0–17	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.6
423	OTHER INFECTIOUS & PARASITIC DISEASES DIAGNOSES	1.0426	23.2	19.3	13.2
424	[5] O.R. PROCEDURE W PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSES OF MENTAL ILLNESS	1.6835	37.1	30.9	19.7
425	[1] ACUTE ADJUSTMENT REACTION & PSYCHOSOCIAL DYSFUNCTION	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.3
426	DEPRESSIVE NEUROSES	0.4038	22.5	18.8	6.8
427	[2] NEUROSES EXCEPT DEPRESSIVE	0.5594	21.0	17.5	7.3
428	DISORDERS OF PERSONALITY & IMPULSE CONTROL	0.5183	24.5	20.4	11.4
429	ORGANIC DISTURBANCES & MENTAL RETARDATION	0.5326	24.0	20.0	8.5
430	PSYCHOSES	0.4024	23.1	19.3	12.6
431	[2] CHILDHOOD MENTAL DISORDERS	0.5594	21.0	17.5	10.1
432	[1] OTHER MENTAL DISORDER DIAGNOSES	0.4175	17.0	14.2	6.1
433	[6] ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE, LEFT AMA	0.4175	17.0	14.2	4.2
439	SKIN GRAFTS FOR INJURIES	1.2203	36.0	30.0	13.6
440	WOUND DEBRIDEMENTS FOR INJURIES	1.2248	34.4	28.7	13.4
441	[2] HAND PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.2
442	OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES W CC	1.3670	34.9	29.1	14.5
443	[6] OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	5.6
444	TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE >17 W CC	0.6598	23.2	19.3	6.4
445	[2] TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.4
446**	[6] TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.4
447	[2] ALLERGIC REACTIONS AGE >17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.9
448**	[6] ALLERGIC REACTIONS AGE 0–17	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.9
449	[3] POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE >17 W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.8
450	[2] POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	2.9
451	[6] POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE 0–17	0.7819	23.9	19.9	14.4
452	COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT W CC	0.9275	25.7	21.4	7.8
453	COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT W/O CC	0.5790	21.6	18.0	4.2
454	[3] OTHER INJURY, POISONING & TOXIC EFFECT DIAG W CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	6.5
455	[6] OTHER INJURY, POISONING & TOXIC EFFECT DIAG W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	3.4
461	O.R. PROC W DIAGNOSES OF OTHER CONTACT W HEALTH SERVICES	1.1466	32.7	27.3	8.8
462	REHABILITATION	0.5823	22.1	18.4	14.8
463	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W CC	0.6082	22.9	19.1	6.1
464	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W/O CC	0.5831	24.3	20.3	4.5

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
465	AFTERCARE W HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS	0.6877	21.2	17.7	5.5
466	AFTERCARE W/O HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS	0.6700	21.7	18.1	7.0
467	[3] OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING HEALTH STATUS	0.7819	23.9	19.9	4.0
468	EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS	2.1478	40.5	33.8	21.4
469***	[7] PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS INVALID AS DISCHARGE DIAGNOSIS	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
470***	[7] UNGROUPABLE	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
471	[5] BILATERAL OR MULTIPLE MAJOR JOINT PROCS OF LOWER EXTREMITY	1.6835	37.1	30.9	6.2
473	ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE AGE >17	0.9917	25.3	21.1	21.4
476	[5] PROSTATIC O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS	1.6835	37.1	30.9	17.7
477	NON-EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS.	1.5119	35.9	29.9	14.8
479	[2] OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	3.9
480***	[7] LIVER TRANSPLANT AND/OR INTESTINAL TRANSPLANT	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
481	[6] BONE MARROW TRANSPLANT	1.1625	29.5	24.6	35.2
482	[5] TRACHEOSTOMY FOR FACE,MOUTH & NECK DIAGNOSES	1.6835	37.1	30.9	17.6
484	[6] CRANIOTOMY FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	1.6835	37.1	30.9	23.1
485	[6] LIMB REATTACHMENT, HIP & FEMUR PROC FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	14.7
486	[3] OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	0.7819	23.9	19.9	21.8
487	[4] OTHER MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	1.1625	29.5	24.6	11.5
488	[4] HIV W EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE	1.1625	29.5	24.6	29.6
489	HIV W MAJOR RELATED CONDITION	0.9436	22.1	18.4	13.3
490	HIV W OR W/O OTHER RELATED CONDITION	0.6456	20.3	16.9	8.5
491	[5] MAJOR JOINT & LIMB REATTACHMENT PROCEDURES OF UPPER EXTREMITY.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	4.5
492	[2] CHEMO W ACUTE LEUKEMIA AS SDX OR W USE OF HIGH DOSE CHEMO AGENT.	0.5594	21.0	17.5	23.1
493	[4] LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY W/O C.D.E. W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.8
494	[6] LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY W/O C.D.E. W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.2
495***	[7] LUNG TRANSPLANT	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
496	[4] COMBINED ANTERIOR/POSTERIOR SPINAL FUSION	1.1625	29.5	24.6	13.8
497	[5] SPINAL FUSION EXCEPT CERVICAL W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	8.3
498	[6] SPINAL FUSION EXCEPT CERVICAL W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	5.3
499	[5] BACK & NECK PROCEDURES EXCEPT SPINAL FUSION W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	6.6
500	[4] BACK & NECK PROCEDURES EXCEPT SPINAL FUSION W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.3
501	KNEE PROCEDURES W PDX OF INFECTION W CC	1.2164	33.3	27.8	15.4
502	[3] KNEE PROCEDURES W PDX OF INFECTION W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	8.7
503	[4] KNEE PROCEDURES W/O PDX OF INFECTION	1.1625	29.5	24.6	6.1
504	[5] EXTENSIVE BURNS OR FULL THICKNESS BURNS W MV 96+ HRS W SKIN GRAFT.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	48.4
505	[5] EXTENSIVE BURNS OR FULL THICKNESS BURNS W MV 96+ HRS W/O SKIN GRAFT.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	9.4
506	[4] FULL THICKNESS BURN W SKIN GRAFT OR INHAL INJ W CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	26.1
507	[6] FULL THICKNESS BURN W SKIN GRFT OR INHAL INJ W/O CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	13.2
508	FULL THICKNESS BURN W/O SKIN GRFT OR INHAL INJ W CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	0.7588	25.6	21.3	12.1
509	[1] FULL THICKNESS BURN W/O SKIN GRFT OR INH INJ W/O CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	8.6
510	NON-EXTENSIVE BURNS W CC OR SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	0.6720	22.6	18.8	9.7
511	[1] NON-EXTENSIVE BURNS W/O CC OR SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.7
512***	[7] SIMULTANEOUS PANCREAS/KIDNEY TRANSPLANT	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
513***	[7] PANCREAS TRANSPLANT	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0
515	[4] CARDIAC DEFIBRILLATOR IMPLANT W/O CARDIAC CATH	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.9
518	[6] PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASC PROC W/O CORONARY ARTERY STENT OR AMI.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	3.7
519	[4] CERVICAL SPINAL FUSION W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	7.4
520	[6] CERVICAL SPINAL FUSION W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	2.8
521	[2] ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE W CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	8.4
522	[6] ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE W REHABILITATION THERAPY W/O CC.	0.5594	21.0	17.5	16.7
523	[1] ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE W/O REHABILITATION THERAPY W/O CC.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.8

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
524	[2] TRANSIENT ISCHEMIA	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.8
525	[6] OTHER HEART ASSIST SYSTEM IMPLANT	1.6835	37.1	30.9	24.1
528	[6] INTRACRANIAL VASCULAR PROCEDURES W PDX HEMORRHAGE	1.6835	37.1	30.9	26.9
529	[5] VENTRICULAR SHUNT PROCEDURES W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	11.7
530	[6] VENTRICULAR SHUNT PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	4.5
531	[5] SPINAL PROCEDURES W CC	1.6835	37.1	30.9	15.5
532	[3] SPINAL PROCEDURES W/O CC	0.7819	23.9	19.9	5.9
533	[4] EXTRACRANIAL PROCEDURES W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.7
534	[6] EXTRACRANIAL PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	2.5
535	[5] CARDIAC DEFIB IMPLANT W CARDIAC CATH W AMI/HF/SHOCK	1.6835	37.1	30.9	15.6
536	[6] CARDIAC DEFIB IMPLANT W CARDIAC CATH W/O AMI/HF/SHOCK	1.1625	29.5	24.6	11.7
537	LOCAL EXCISION & REMOVAL INT FIX DEVICES EXCEPT HIP & FEMUR W CC.	1.4672	39.9	33.3	10.8
538	[4] LOCAL EXCISION & REMOVAL INT FIX DEVICES EXCEPT HIP & FEMUR W/O CC.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	4.5
539	[4] LYMPHOMA & LEUKEMIA W MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE W CC	1.1625	29.5	24.6	18.1
540	[6] LYMPHOMA & LEUKEMIA W MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE W/O CC	0.4175	17.0	14.2	5.6
541	ECMO OR TRACH W MV 96+ HRS OR PDX EXC FACE, MOUTH & NECK W MAJ O.R..	3.8893	58.1	48.4	65.8
542	TRACH W MV 96+ HRS OR PDX EXC FACE, MOUTH & NECK W/O MAJ O.R.	2.8689	45.1	37.6	49.1
543	[5] CRANIOTOMY W MAJOR DEVICE IMPLANT OR ACUTE COMPLEX CNS PDX	1.6835	37.1	30.9	20.4
544	[5] MAJOR JOINT REPLACEMENT OR REATTACHMENT OF LOWER EXTREMITY.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	6.1
545	[5] REVISION OF HIP OR KNEE REPLACEMENT	1.6835	37.1	30.9	7.4
546	[6] SPINAL FUSION EXC CERV WITH CURVATURE OF THE SPINE OR MALIG ..	1.6835	37.1	30.9	13.4
547	[6] CORONARY BYPASS W CARDIAC CATH W MAJOR CV DX	1.1625	29.5	24.6	17.8
548	[6] CORONARY BYPASS W CARDIAC CATH W/O MAJOR CV DX	1.1625	29.5	24.6	12.0
549	[6] CORONARY BYPASS W/O CARDIAC CATH W MAJOR CV DX	1.1625	29.5	24.6	15.0
550	[6] CORONARY BYPASS W/O CARDIAC CATH W/O MAJOR CV DX	1.1625	29.5	24.6	9.3
551	PERMANENT CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPL W MAJ CV DX OR AICD LEAD OR GNRTR.	1.6035	29.5	24.6	10.3
552	[4] OTHER PERMANENT CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPLANT W/O MAJOR CV DX	1.1625	29.5	24.6	5.5
553	OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES W CC W MAJOR CV DX	1.5837	32.5	27.1	15.8
554	OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES W CC W/O MAJOR CV DX	1.2817	31.6	26.3	9.3
555	[3] PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASCULAR PROC W MAJOR CV DX	0.7819	23.9	19.9	7.8
556	[6] PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASC PROC W NON-DRUG-ELUTING STENT W/O MAJ CV DX.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.9
557	[4] PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASCULAR PROC W DRUG-ELUTING STENT W MAJOR CV DX.	1.1625	29.5	24.6	6.5
558	[6] PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASCULAR PROC W DRUG-ELUTING STENT W/O MAJ CV DX.	0.4175	17.0	14.2	2.6
559	[6] ACUTE ISCHEMIC STROKE WITH USE OF THROMBOLYTIC AGENT	0.7819	23.9	19.9	10.7
560	BACTERIAL & TUBERCULOUS INFECTIONS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM	0.9308	25.5	21.3	16.9
561	NON-BACTERIAL INFECTIONS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM EXCEPT VIRAL MENINGITIS.	0.8145	22.3	18.6	15.5
562	SEIZURE AGE >17 W CC	0.6844	23.2	19.3	7.6
563	[2] SEIZURE AGE >17 W/O CC	0.5594	21.0	17.5	4.9
564	HEADACHES AGE >17	0.7565	24.1	20.1	5.3
565	RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSIS WITH VENTILATOR SUPPORT 96+ HOURS.	2.0557	34.7	28.9	23.3
566	RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSIS WITH VENTILATOR SUPPORT < 96 HOURS.	1.5445	27.4	22.8	13.2
567	[5] STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROC AGE >17 W CC W MAJOR GI DX.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	25.4
568	[5] STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROC AGE >17 W CC W/O MAJOR GI DX.	1.6835	37.1	30.9	19.2
569	[5] MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W CC W MAJOR GI DX	1.6835	37.1	30.9	22.5
570	[5] MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W CC W/O MAJOR GI DX	1.6835	37.1	30.9	14.9
571	MAJOR ESOPHAGEAL DISORDERS	0.8214	21.9	18.3	7.5
572	MAJOR GASTROINTESTINAL DISORDERS AND PERITONEAL INFECTIONS	0.8505	23.3	19.4	11.0
573	[5] MAJOR BLADDER PROCEDURES	1.6835	37.1	30.9	16.7
574	MAJOR HEMATOLOGIC/IMMUNOLOGIC DIAG EXC SICKLE CELL CRISIS & COAGUL.	0.8106	19.7	16.4	9.1
575	SEPTICEMIA W MV 96+ HOURS AGE >17	1.6583	27.8	23.2	24.4

TABLE 3: FY 2007 LTC–DRGS, RELATIVE WEIGHTS, GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY, FIVE-SIXTHS OF THE GEOMETRIC AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY AND THE IPPS AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY PLUS ONE STANDARD DEVIATION—Continued

LTC–DRG	Description	Relative weight	Geometric average length of stay	5/6ths of the geometric average length of stay	IPPS average length of stay plus one standard deviation*
576	SEPTICEMIA W/O MV 96+ HOURS AGE >17	0.7925	23.0	19.2	11.8
577	[6] CAROTID ARTERY STENT PROCEDURE	1.1625	29.5	24.6	3.3
578	O. R. PROCEDURE W PDX EXC POSTOPERATIVE OR POST-TRAUMATIC INFECTION.	1.4849	35.7	29.8	26.5
579	O. R. PROCEDURE W PDX OF POSTOPERATIVE OR POST-TRAUMATIC INFECTION.	1.2978	35.2	29.3	18.0

[1] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to low-volume quintile 1.
[2] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to low-volume quintile 2.
[3] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to low-volume quintile 3.
[4] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to low-volume quintile 4.
[5] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to low-volume quintile 5.
[6] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined by assigning these cases to the appropriate low volume quintile because they had no LTCH cases in the FY 2005 MedPAR file.
[7] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were assigned a value of 0.0000.
[8] Relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were determined after adjusting to account for nonmonotonicity.
* ''IPPS Comparable Threshold'' for the revision to the short-stay outlier policy, as discussed in section V.A.2. of the preamble of this final rule.
** IPPS hospital statistical data for these LTC–DRGs was supplemented due to a low volume of IPPS cases.
*** Although IPPS hospital statistical data for these DRGs may be available, a value of zero for the ''IPPS Comparable Threshold'' was assigned for these LTC–DRGs since the relative weights for these LTC–DRGs were assigned a value of 0.0000, as discussed in section III. of the preamble of this final rule.

[FR Doc. 07–2206 Filed 5–1–07; 4:00 pm]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P



Federal Register

Friday,

May 11, 2007

Part III

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Fiscal Year 2007 SuperNOFA for HUD's Discretionary Programs; Supplementary Information and Technical Corrections; Notice

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5100–C–01]

Fiscal Year 2007 SuperNOFA for HUD's Discretionary Programs; Supplementary Information and Technical Corrections

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HUD.

ACTION: Notice of Supplementary Information and Technical Corrections to Fiscal Year 2007 SuperNOFA for HUD's Discretionary Programs.

SUMMARY: On January 18, 2007, HUD published its Notice of HUD's Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Policy Requirements and General Section to the FY 2007 SuperNOFA for HUD's Discretionary Programs (General Section). On March 13, 2007, HUD published its FY 2007 SuperNOFA for HUD's Discretionary Programs (FY 2007 SuperNOFA). In this notice published in today's **Federal Register**, HUD announces that it has posted corrected materials to Grants.gov, extends deadline dates for submission of applications, and clarifies requirements for submitting faxed documents. HUD is also providing supplemental information for and making technical corrections to the General Section and several individual program NOFAs.

HUD has found that the Logic Models posted to Grants.gov included an error in the instructions and programming errors that could lead applicants to submit deficient or less competitive applications. HUD is posting corrected Logic Models to Grants.gov. Applicants who have signed up for the Grants.gov notification services will be automatically notified when the corrected Logic Models and these technical corrections are posted to Grants.gov. Applicants that have not signed up for the notification services should check the Grants.gov Web site for the modification to the announcement posting following publication of this Notice. In order to give applicants the opportunity and time to submit or resubmit their applications with the corrected Logic Models, HUD is reopening competition for program NOFAs whose deadline dates have already passed and extending the deadline dates for all NOFAs. Applicants that wish to resubmit their applications must submit an entire, complete application. Applicants that submit more than one electronic copy of the same application must resubmit all faxed documents after receipt and validation by Grants.gov of each revised application. This will ensure that the faxes are associated with the revised application.

Finally, this document provides supplementary information for and makes corrections to the General Section and the individual NOFAs for the following programs, which were included in the FY 2007 SuperNOFA: Community Development Technical Assistance Programs (CD–TA), Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program, Lead Hazard Reduction Grant Program, Operation Lead Elimination Action Program, Technical Studies Programs (Lead Technical Studies and Healthy Homes Technical Studies), Lead Outreach Program, Healthy Homes Demonstration Grants Program, Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program Coordinators, Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS)—Elderly/Persons with Disabilities, ROSS—Family-Homeownership, Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program, Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program, Early Doctoral Student Research Program, and Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program. Applicants who have submitted their applications prior to this publication should resubmit a complete, updated application that reflects any applicable corrections and clarifications, along with the corrected Logic Model described below in section II. The last application received and validated by Grants.gov by the deadline date will be the application that is reviewed, rated, and ranked.

The supplementary information and technical corrections in this notice are reflected in the instruction packages but do not affect the application packages on Grants.gov.

DATES: The application deadline dates for the all program NOFAs are extended to the dates provided in Appendix A of this notice published in today's **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding the General Section of the SuperNOFA published January 18, 2007, should be directed to the Office of Departmental Grants Management and Oversight, Office of Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Room 3156, Washington, DC 20410–5000; telephone number (202) 708–0667. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number via TTY by calling the Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877–8339. For the programs listed in this notice, please contact the office or individual listed under Section VII of the individual program sections of the SuperNOFA, published on March 13, 2007.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On January 18, 2007 (72 FR 2396), HUD published the General Section in advance of the FY 2007 SuperNOFA to provide prospective applicants additional time to become familiar with and address provisions that apply to almost every application. On March 13, 2007 (72 FR 11434), HUD published the FY 2007 SuperNOFA, which announced the availability of approximately $2 billion in HUD assistance. In this notice published in today's **Federal Register**, HUD announces that it has posted corrected materials to Grants.gov, extends deadline dates for submission of applications, and clarifies requirements for submitting faxed documents. HUD is also providing supplemental information for and making technical corrections to the General Section and several individual program NOFAs.

II. Submission or Resubmission of Applications With Corrected Logic Model

HUD has found that the Logic Models posted to Grants.gov included an error in the instructions regarding the references to the Standard Form (SF) 424 Box 8a (Applicant Legal Name) and Box 15 (Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project). The Logic Models also had some programming errors which caused the drop down menus to operate improperly. In addition, the Lead Outreach Grant Program (LOGP) Logic Model was corrected to delete references to technical assistance activities which are no longer eligible activities under the 2007 LOGP NOFA. Finally, the Continuum of Care, Housing Choice Voucher Family Self Sufficiency, and Public Housing Family Self Sufficiency Logic Models have been updated to include an additional management question. HUD is posting corrected Logic Models to the Grants.gov instructions download for all 2007 NOFAs. For Continuum of Care applicants, the revised Logic Model will be posted to HUD's funding available page at *http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/nofa07/grpcoc.cfr.* All applicants should use the corrected version of each program Logic Model. For applicants filing electronically, when resubmitting your revised application, please use the same application and facsimile transmittal

cover page that you used to submit your original application. Continuum of Care applicants should resubmit their revised application in paper format following the NOFA instructions. HUD recommends that any applicants that already submitted an application resubmit a revised application using the corrected version of the program Logic Model. HUD will rate and rank the latest version of each application submitted. Applicants who fail to submit a revised application and use the incorrect version of the Logic Model might inadvertently select ineligible or less desirable options and be rated less favorably as a result.

III. Reopening of NOFAS and Extensions of Deadline Dates

To provide applicants the opportunity and time to submit or resubmit their complete applications with the corrected Logic Models, HUD is reopening competition for program NOFAs whose deadline dates have passed and extending the deadline dates for all other NOFAs. Applicants may submit applications for NOFAs to meet the new extended deadline dates, whether or not they submitted an application prior to today's notice. The new deadline dates are provided in Appendix A to this notice published in today's **Federal Register**. The new deadline dates are also reflected in the technical corrections to individual program NOFAs below. In the event of a discrepancy between a deadline date in Appendix A to this notice and the deadline date in the individual program NOFAs after the amendments made below, the deadline date in Appendix A to this notice prevails.

IV. Faxing Documents to HUD

Applicants submitting an application in response to this notice must follow the instructions for submitting faxed documents in the General Section. HUD will only accept complete applications. Subsequent submissions of the same application must comply with the following, additional instructions. Submissions must include all faxes. Faxes must be submitted following validation of each revised application by Grants.gov to ensure faxes are matched to the latest application submission.

In addition, HUD is taking the opportunity in this technical correction to clarify its policy for applicants to follow when submitting technical cures to an application submission following HUD review and request for a technical cure to an application submission. For electronic application submitters only, HUD will be requesting that technical cures be submitted using the fax transmittal form and faxed to the facsimile solution number used when submitting faxes with your application submission. This policy ensures that a complete application, including any technical cures requested by HUD staff during the review and evaluation process, will be available in electronic format in HUD's grants system. Beginning in FY 2007 with funding announcements, it is HUD's intent to make available the highest rated application available for public view on HUD's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Web site. Therefore, applicants submitting technical cures requested by HUD staff should submit the material using the same form HUD–96011 cover sheet used to submit faxes with your application submission. The material should be sent using the facsimile solution fax numbers found in the General Section. Prior to placing an application on the FOIA Web site, HUD will conduct a privacy review and redact private information. However, if applicants submit applications with proprietary information they should note the information is proprietary in their application submission.

V. Supplemental Information and Technical Corrections

This notice also provides supplemental information and makes technical corrections to the General Section and to the individual NOFAs for the following programs, which were included in the FY 2007 SuperNOFA: Community Development Technical Assistance Programs (CD–TA), Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program, Lead Hazard Reduction Grant Program, Operation Lead Elimination Action Program, Technical Studies Programs (Lead Technical Studies and Healthy Homes Technical Studies), Lead Outreach Program, Healthy Homes Demonstration Grants Program, Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program Coordinators, Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS)—Elderly/Persons with Disabilities, ROSS–Family-Homeownership, Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program, Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program, Early Doctoral Student Research Program, and Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program.

Summaries of the technical corrections made by this document are provided below. The **Federal Register** page number shown in brackets identifies where the individual funding availability announcement that is being corrected can be found either in the January 18, 2007, General Section or the March 13, 2007, SuperNOFA. The technical corrections described in today's **Federal Register** are also reflected in the updated application instructions download for the funding opportunity located on Grants.gov. HUD recommends that applicants who have submitted their applications prior to this publication should resubmit an entire, complete, revised application that reflects any applicable corrections and clarifications, along with the corrected Logic Model described above in section II. The last application received and validated by Grants.gov by the deadline date will be the application that is reviewed, rated, and ranked. For Continuum of Care applicants, HUD will review the last complete paper application received in accordance with the Continuum of Care NOFA instructions.

A. General Section [2396]

On page 2409, section V.A.1.b., first column, HUD is adding the instruction that when responding to Rating Factor 1, Capacity, applicants should not include social security numbers on any resumes submitted to HUD.

On page 2416, section VIII.F., second column, HUD is adding a new section VIII.F.3. describing the statutory limitation on the use of HUD grant funds to support projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain. Congress made the limitation applicable to funds under the FY 2007 SuperNOFA after HUD published the General Section. Recipients may use HUD funds to seek a government's use of its power to take property only if the power is employed for public use. Economic development that primarily benefits private entities is not considered a public use. However, transportation and utility projects that serve the general public, as well as projects that remove threats to public health and safety or clean up brownfields, are considered examples of public use.

On page 2416, section VIII., third column, HUD is adding a new section VIII.I., which summarizes guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that applies to the cost sharing and matching requirements in the FY 2007 SuperNOFA. This section notes the importance of complying with applicable OMB circulars, particularly with respect to funds used or proposed to be used to satisfy cost sharing or matching requirements. OMB Circulars A–102 (as implemented by 24 CFR part 85), A–110 (as implemented by 24 CFR

part 84), A–87, and A–122 set forth administrative standards and cost principles, including requirements that apply to cost sharing and matching, organized according to the status of the entity receiving a grant or cooperative agreement.

B. Community Development Technical Assistance (CD–TA) Program NOFA [11449]

HUD is amending the CD–TA program to implement two revisions. The first revision will assist applicants to distinguish between TA priorities for applicants who submit an application for a national homeless TA program and applicants that submit an application for a local (i.e., within the jurisdiction of a HUD field office) homeless TA program.

HUD inadvertently omitted from the CD–TA NOFA language that referenced priorities to be carried out by TA providers that work on the local level within the jurisdiction of specific HUD field offices. Without guidance for applicants on the local level, homeless TA applicants, regardless of whether they apply for national TA or local TA in the field offices, would be required to submit applications focused on Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) activities.

With the revisions presented in this notice, applicants must, in response to Rating Factors 2 through 5, discuss the specific TA activities that will be carried out during the term of the grant. These activities need to relate to the eligible activities listed in Section III.C. of the CD–TA program NOFA. Because the NOFA, as published on March 13, 2007, inadvertently requires applicants for local TA to relate activities to the national HMIS priorities, HUD is clarifying the local TA priorities in this notice.

The second revision implemented by this notice clarifies the HOME TA funds that are available under the CD–TA NOFA. In the NOFA, HUD inadvertently stated that a single applicant organization is limited to 20 percent of the $18,000,000 made available for HOME and CHDO TA in FY 2007. However, by statute, this amount is limited to amounts that are appropriated and does not include other available funds. As a result, HUD is revising the CD–TA NOFA to state that a single applicant organization is limited to 20 percent of the $9.9 million appropriated in FY 2007.

This amendment contains information that applicants for local homeless TA and HOME TA need to complete adequately their applications. Those applicants who have already submitted an application are encouraged to review this notice and resubmit a revised application.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

C. Indian Community Development Block Grant Program for Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages [11449]

On page 11456, section IV.C.1., first column, HUD is deleting a sentence describing submission requirements for applicants that are granted a waiver of electronic submission requirements. Any such applicants will receive submission requirements once a waiver is granted.

This correction is reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

D. Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program; Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant Program; and Operation Lead Elimination Action Program [Page 11539]

On page 11548, section V.A.1.b.(2), third column, HUD is clarifying the term ''current or previous grantee'' by adding ''awarded funds in FY 2002 or later.''

On page 11549, section V.A.2., first column, first full paragraph, HUD is correcting the HUDuser Web site address, which may be used to verify income data submitted to HUD.

On page 11552, section V.A.4., second column, third full paragraph, first sentence, HUD is correcting the minimum match requirement for the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control and Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration programs to be 10 percent. This correction makes this statement consistent with other statements in the NOFA (e.g., page 11540, section I.B.3, left column; page 11541, section III.B., left column; and page 11543, section III.C.3.a., left column).

On page 11552, section V.A.4., third column, HUD is correcting the table header to read ''LEAP.'' This correction makes the header of the table at the top of the third column consistent with the last header of the table in second column, which continues in the third column.

On page 11553, section V.B.2.b., column 3, HUD is correcting the description of the factors for award by stating that a minimum of 75 points is required for award. This corrects the inadvertent omission of the minimum rating score for award among eligible applicants, which is the same as in the FY 2006 combined Lead Hazard Control NOFA.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

E. Lead Technical Studies NOFA (Combined) Grant Program [Page 11556]

On page 11557, Overview Information, section G.2., left column, HUD is correcting the amount of available funding for the combined Technical Studies grant programs from $5.6 million to $5.0 million, and the Lead Technical Studies grant program from $3.6 million to $3.0 million. This reflects a more accurate assessment of the amount of funds available for the Lead Technical Studies grant program.

On page 11558, section II.A., center column, HUD is correcting the amount of available funding for the Lead Technical Studies grant program from $3.6 million to $3.0 million. This reflects a more accurate assessment of the amount of funds available for this grant program.

On page 11562, section IV.B.1.g.(5)(b), right column, HUD is correcting the checklist for the budget to include the budget narrative, which was inadvertently omitted from the checklist. This correction makes the checklist consistent with the requirement on page 11565, section V.A.3.c.(5)(b), second column.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

F. Lead Outreach Program [Page 11568]

On page 11568, HUD is correcting the title by deleting line 5, ''Technical Studies NOFA''. Mentioning the Technical Studies NOFA in the title implies that the Lead Outreach NOFA and Technical Studies NOFA are connected, which is not the case.

This correction is reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the

instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

G. Healthy Homes Demonstration Grant Program [Page 11578]

On page 11578, HUD is correcting the header by deleting line 5, ''Technical Studies NOFA''. Mentioning the Technical Studies NOFA implies that the Healthy Homes Demonstration NOFA and Technical Studies NOFA are connected, which is not the case.

On page 11584, section IV.B.7., first column, second bullet, second listed submission requirement, HUD is correcting the checklist's identification of the detailed budget worksheet from Form HUD–424-CB, ''Grant Application Detailed Budget,'' to Form HUD–424–CBW, ''Grant Application Detailed Budget Worksheet''. This correction makes the checklist consistent with rating factor 3 (page 11588, section V.A.2.c.(3), left column), in which the applicant is asked to provide the worksheet.

On page 11584, section IV.B.7., first column, second bullet, HUD is correcting the checklist by adding the budget narrative to the list of materials required to be submitted in response to rating factors. This correction makes the checklist consistent with Rating Factor 3 (page 11588, section V.A.2.c.(3), center column), in which the applicant is asked to provide the 4-page (maximum) budget narrative.

On page 11588, section V.A.2.c.(3), second column, HUD is clarifying the requirement for the budget package to include a budget narrative, as well as the budget itself, for any sub-grantee proposed to receive more than 10 percent of the total federal budget request. This will clarify the requirement on page 11583, section IV.B.6.c., right column, and inform applicants that a separate budget proposal should be provided for certain sub-recipients.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

H. Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program Coordinators [Page 11593]

On page 11595, section IV.B.1., third column, HUD is clarifying applicants' obligation to submit form HUD–2991, Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan. Applicants may satisfy this requirement by submitting a copy of the signed PHA Certification of Compliance for their current Annual PHA Plan.

This correction is reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

I. ROSS—Elderly/Persons With Disabilities Program [Page 11610]

On page 11614, section III.C.1., second column, HUD is adding ''program outreach to participants'' to the list of eligible activities.

On page 11614, section III.C.2.a., third column, HUD is removing the requirement for match-related letters of commitment, memoranda of understanding, and tribal resolutions to be on letterhead. HUD is also deleting the duplicative statement in the same sentence that such documents must be signed by a person authorized to commit the matching resources. The signature requirement is set forth in the immediately preceding sentence and is not affected by this change. The requirement that letters of support from Resident Associations and PHAs must be on letterhead is also unaffected by this change.

On page 11616, section III.C.4.c.(3), second column, HUD is deleting the repetitive statements that joint applications involving nonprofit organizations must include evidence of resident support for the nonprofit organization. The requirement for nonprofit non-lead applicants to submit letters of support is already stated in section III.C.4.c.(1).

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

J. ROSS Family and Homeownership Program [Page 11625]

On page 11628, section II.A.5., first column, HUD is correcting the misstatement that the total funding amounts described are for ROSS—Elderly/Persons with Disabilities grants. The correction clarifies that the total funding amounts are for ROSS—Family and Homeownership grants.

On page 11629, section II.C.1.a., first column, first partial paragraph, HUD is correcting the reference to HUD's policy priority to provide the complete title of the policy priority, which is ''Providing Increased Homeownership and Rental Opportunities for Low- and Moderate-Income Persons, Persons with Disabilities, the Elderly, Minorities, and Families with Limited English Proficiency.''

On page 11630, section II.C.b.(10), second column, HUD is deleting ''program outreach'' from the list of administrative costs and adding it to the list of eligible activities in section II.C.b.(11).

On page 11630, section III.C.2.a., third column, HUD is removing the requirement for match-related letters of commitment, memoranda of understanding, and tribal resolutions to be on letterhead. HUD is also deleting the duplicative statement in the same sentence that such documents must be signed by a person authorized to commit the matching resources. The signature requirement is set forth in the immediately preceding sentence and is not affected by this change. The requirement that letters of support from Resident Associations and PHAs must be on letterhead is also unaffected by this change.

On page 11632, section III.C.4.c.(3), second column, HUD is deleting the statement that joint applications involving nonprofit organizations must include evidence of resident support for the nonprofit organization. The requirement for nonprofit non-lead applicants to submit letters of support is already stated in section III.C.4.c.(1).

On page 11634, section IV.E.3., first column, HUD is deleting ''program outreach'' from the list of administrative costs.

On page 11636, section V.A.1.c.(1)(a)(i), third column, HUD is increasing the total number of points available for involving community partners in the delivery of services from 4 to 6. HUD is making this change so that the total points available for the criterion, Specific Services and/or Activities, will correctly add up to 12.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

K. Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program [Page 11649]

On page 11656, section V.A., first column, under paragraph d. of Submission Requirements for Rating Factor 3, HUD is adding a requirement that applicants must state how the sales

price for SHOP-assisted units is established. HUD is also modifying an existing, related requirement. With this change, applicants must demonstrate how, rather than simply the extent to which, SHOP funds, sweat equity, and other contributed resources reduce the average sales price below the appraised value of the home or the market value of comparable housing in the neighborhood.

On page 11659, section VI.A.1., second column, HUD is adding an additional basis on which it may fund less than the amount requested by an applicant.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

L. Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS

On page 11663, section II.A., first column, HUD is reducing to $2.3 million its estimate of funds that will be available after it makes awards based on renewal applications for existing projects. HUD has received more applications for renewal than it had anticipated.

M. Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program [Page 11697]

On page 11702, section III.C.2.b.(3)(c)(ii), third column, HUD is extending the deadline for receipt by the local HUD office of Phase II Environmental Site Assessments to July 16, 2007.

On page 11702, section III.C.2.b.(3)(c)(iii), third column, HUD is extending the deadline for receipt by the local HUD office of the description of the extent of the contamination and the plan for clean-up of the site to July 16, 2007.

On page 11712, section V.A.1., first column, HUD is increasing the number of points available under Rating Factor 1, Capacity of the Applicant and Relevant Organizational Staff, from 23 to 25 points.

On page 11712, section V.A.1.a., second column, HUD is increasing the number of points available for the experience and capacity criteria described from 13 to 15.

On page 11713, section V.A.3., second column, HUD is decreasing the number of points available under rating Factor 3, Soundness of Approach, from 47 to 45.

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c., third column, HUD is decreasing the number of points available for the suitability of the site from 10 to 8.

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c.(2)(a), third column, HUD is clarifying the first of three enumerated statistical conditions in which a neighborhood meets the definition of a ''minority neighborhood (area of minority concentration).''

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c.(2)(b), third column, HUD is clarifying the second of three enumerated statistical conditions in which a neighborhood meets the definition of a ''minority neighborhood (area of minority concentration).''

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

N. Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons With Disabilities [Page 11719]

On page 11724, section III.C.2.b.(3)(d)(ii), first column, HUD is extending the deadline for receipt by the local HUD office of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment to July 23, 2007.

On page 11724, section III.C.2.b.(3)(d)(iii), first column, HUD is extending the deadline for receipt by the local HUD office of the description of the extent of the contamination and the plan for clean-up of the site to July 23, 2007.

On page 11740, section V.B.4.(c), first column, first full paragraph, HUD is correcting the first funding priority for any funds remaining after the Multifamily HUB selection process is completed. HUD will use the residual funds first to fund Way Station, Incorporated, an FY 2006 applicant that was not funded due to an administrative error. The funding priorities that were previously designated as first and second priorities are now redesignated as second and third priorities, respectively, for any remaining funds.

On page 11740, section VI.C.1., third column, HUD is deleting a sentence fragment that was mistakenly included in the section on reporting requirements.

These corrections are reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

O. The Early Doctoral Student Research Program and Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program [Page 11758]

On page 11760, section II.C.1, HUD is clarifying that indirect costs are not eligible costs under the Early Doctoral Student Research Program or the Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program.

This correction is reflected in the instructions found on Grants.gov. Applicants must download the instructions to receive all forms and instructions related to this NOFA. Applicants are encouraged to read the instructions on Grants.gov prior to submitting their applications.

Accordingly, in the Notice of HUD's FY 2007 NOFA General Section, beginning at 72 FR 2395, in the issue of January 18, 2007, the following corrections are made.

1. General Section

On page 2409, section V.A.1.b., first column, at the beginning of the paragraph following ''Factor 5: Achieving Results and Program Evaluation,'' add the following sentence:

When responding to Rating Factor 1, Capacity, applicants should not include social security numbers on any resumes submitted to HUD.

On page 2416, section VIII.F., second column, add the following new section VIII.F.3.:

3. Eminent Domain

The Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Pub. L. 110–5, approved February 15, 2007) was enacted after publication of the General Section and made HUD's FY 2007 appropriated funds subject to the same conditions imposed on its FY 2006 funds. Section 726 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Pub. L. 109–115, approved November 30, 2005) states that no funds made available under the Act may be used to support any federal, state, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use. This limitation applies to FY 2007 appropriated funds.

For purposes of this provision, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities.

Further, any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects, as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-

related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfield as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Pub. L. 107–118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

On page 2416, section VIII., third column, add the following new section VIII.I.:

I. Office of Management and Budget Circular Compliance

On February 15, 2007, President Bush signed into law the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Pub. L. 110–5, approved February 15, 2007) (CR), which provided FY 2007 appropriations for the majority of federal departments and agencies. For the federal departments and agencies funded by this CR, the CR restricts the programs and activities of these departments and agencies largely to FY 2006 funding levels. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has issued guidance to federal departments and agencies regarding administration of funds appropriated by the CR. (See OMB Memorandum (M–07–10) issued February 15, 2007.)

In this guidance, OMB emphasizes the importance of agencies adhering to existing statutes, regulations, and Administration policy with respect to promoting and providing for competition in soliciting offers and awarding contracts and competitive grants. With respect to HUD's FY 2007 SuperNOFA, it is important to note that the following OMB circulars are applicable, and particular note should be given to the provisions concerning the use of federal funds for matching requirements.

OMB Circular A–102 (Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments) establishes consistency and uniformity among federal agencies in the management of grants and cooperative agreements with state, local, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments. The circular provides that state and local administration of federal funds must include fiscal and administrative requirements that are sufficiently specific to ensure that: Funds are used in compliance with all applicable federal statutory and regulatory provisions, costs are reasonable and necessary for operating these programs, and funds are not to be used for general expenses required to carry out other responsibilities of a state or its subrecipients.

OMB Circular A–110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations) sets forth standards for obtaining consistency and uniformity among federal agencies in the administration of grants to and agreements with institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other non-profit organizations. This circular specifies the conditions for which funds may be used for cost sharing or matching and provides that federal funds shall not be accepted as cost sharing or matching except where authorized by federal statute to be used for cost sharing or matching.

OMB Circular A–87 (Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments) establishes principles and standards for determining costs for federal awards carried out through grants, cost reimbursement contracts, and other agreements with states and local governments and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments (governmental units). This circular provides that an allowable cost under a federal award does not include a cost sharing or matching requirement of any other federal award in the applicable funding period, except as specifically provided by federal law or regulation.

OMB Circular A–122 (Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations) establishes principles for determining costs of grants, contracts, and other agreements with non-profit organizations. This circular provides, similar to OMB Circular A–87, that an allowable cost under a federal award does not include a cost sharing or matching requirement of any other federally-financed program in the applicable funding period.

Applicants for funding under HUD's FY 2007 SuperNOFA are reminded of the importance of confirming that any federal grant funds that they intend to use as a matching share are available to be used as matching funds under applicable statutes and regulations.

In the Notice of HUD's FY 2007 SuperNOFA, beginning at 72 FR 11433, in the issue of March 13, 2007, the following corrections are made.

2. Community Development Technical Assistance (CD–TA) Program NOFA

On page 11441, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 22, 2007.

On page 11444, section III.C.1.c., second column, the last sentence in the paragraph is revised by adding the word ''National'' at the beginning of the sentence to read as follows:

''National TA activities are focused on these priorities that result in measurable performance output and outcomes.''

On page 11444, section II.C.1., second column, redesignate section II.C.1.c. as section II.C.1.c.(1). In redesignated section II.C.1.c.(1), further redesignate paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (a) through (e).

On page 11444, section II.C.1.c., center column, after redesignated paragraph (e) of national priorities, add the following:

(2) Additionally, local TA activities are focused on these priorities:

(a) Capacity building for CoCs, including facilitating the exchange of information that would help CoCs, grantees and project sponsors carry out the purposes of the McKinney-Vento Act homeless assistance programs, and assisting in identifying and overcoming barriers to the CoC's success in doing so. Deliverables for this technical assistance should include agenda(s), meeting minutes, written summary report(s) including reports on the barriers and methods of overcoming them, next steps with responsible party(ies) identified, and time lines.

(b) Assisting CoCs, grantees and project sponsors to improve access to mainstream systems of care for homeless persons. Deliverables for this technical assistance should include agenda(s), meeting minutes, written summary report(s), next steps with responsible party(ies) identified, and time lines.

(c) Assisting grantees and project sponsors with understanding program requirements and monitoring standards, including sound fiscal and financial management practices, assessment of sub-recipients and providing TA to help CoCs assess grantees, project sponsors and individual projects.

(d) Presenting curriculums, in person or via interactive web presentations, that were developed for HUD Headquarters.

Materials developed for a single-use technical assistance engagement (e.g. agenda, CoC strategic planning, etc.) do not need HUD Headquarters review. However, any materials developed as part of a curriculum or developed to serve more than one CoC, must receive HUD Headquarters review and approval before being used.

On page 11445, section IV.E., third column, the last sentence in the second

paragraph under section IV.E is revised to read as follows:

In addition, funding under either HOME or CHDO (HOME) TA to any single organization is limited to 20 percent of the $9.9 million appropriated for HOME and CHDO (HOME) TA in FY 2007.

3. Indian Community Development Block Grant Program for Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages

On page 11450, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: Application Deadline: Applications must be received and validated no later than the deadline date of June 20, 2007. Please see Section IV of this NOFA for application submission and timely receipt requirements.

On page 11456, section IV.C.1., first column, delete the following sentence:

If you are granted a waiver of the electronic submission requirements, and are submitting a paper application, your completed application must be received by HUD no later than 11:59:59 p.m. on the application deadline date.

On page 11456, section IV.C.1., first column, the first complete sentence is revised to read as follows:

The application deadline date is June 20, 2007.

4. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Program

On page 11468, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic application submission and receipt requirements.

5. Hispanic-Serving Institutions Assisting Communities (HSIAC) Program

On page 11478, Overview information, section F, left column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic application submission and receipt requirements.

6. Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian Institutions Assisting Communities (AN/NHIAC) Program

On page 11488, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic application submission and receipt requirements.

7. Tribal Colleges and Universities Program (TCUP)

On page 11498, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic application submission and receipt requirements.

8. Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP)

On page 11507, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 pm on the application deadline date. Please see the General Section of the SuperNOFA (the General Section) for information on electronic deadline and timeliness requirements.

On page 11513, section IV.C., first column, the first complete sentence is revised to read as follows:

Applications must be received and validated by *http://www.grants.gov/applicants/apply_for_grants.jsp* no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date of June 13, 2007, to be considered timely filed.

9. Housing Counseling Program

On page 11525, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 14, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See Section IV of the General Section, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

10. Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program; Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant Program; and Operation Lead Elimination Action Program

On page 11539, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 15, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See Section IV of the General Section, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

On page 11548, section V.A.1.b.(2), third column, is clarified to read as follows:

(2) Current or previous grantees awarded funds in FY 2002 or later under any of this NOFA's programs: HUD will evaluate the applicant's quarterly performance reports for the most recent four (4) quarters, and award a maximum of 10 points based on the performance ratings.

On page 11549, section V.A.2., first column, first full paragraph, the second Web site address is corrected to read as follows: *http://www.huduser.org/datasets/il/il07/index.html*.

On page 11552, section V.A.4., second column, third full paragraph, first sentence, is corrected to read as follows:

LBPHC and LHRD applicants will be given higher points for leveraged contributions that the applicant commits over and above the 10 percent statutory match requirement.

On page 11552, section V.A.4., third column, the table header is corrected to read ''LEAP''.

On page 11553, section V.B.2.b., third column, is corrected to read as follows:

b. The maximum number of points to be awarded is 100 plus two bonus points as described in the General Section and above. A minimum of 75 points is required for award.

11. Lead Technical Studies and Healthy Homes Technical Studies (combined) Grant Program

On page 11557, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 15, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by *Grants.gov* no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See Section IV of the General Section, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

On page 11557, Overview Information, section G.2., left column, is corrected to read as follows:

2. *Available funding:* HUD anticipates that approximately $5.0 million will be available. Of this, approximately $3.0 million is for Lead Technical Studies and approximately $2.0 million is for Healthy Homes Technical Studies.

On page 11558 section II.A, second column, first sentence, is corrected to read as follows:

Approximately $3.0 million in Fiscal Year 2007 funds are available for Lead Technical Studies.

On page 11562, section IV.B.1.g.(5)(b), third column, is corrected to read as follows:

(b) Form–424–CBW (Budget Worksheet) and a budget narrative.

12. Lead Outreach Program

On page 11568, the title is corrected by deleting line 5, ''Technical Studies NOFA''.

On page 11569, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 15, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See Section IV of the General Section, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

13. Healthy Homes Demonstration Grant Program

On page 11578, the title is corrected by deleting line 5, ''Technical Studies NOFA''.

On page 11579, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 15, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See the General Section IV, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

On page 11584, section IV.B.7, first column, second bullet, the second listed submission requirement is corrected to read as follows:

Form HUD–424–CBW, ''Grant Application Detailed Budget Worksheet'' (HUD Detailed Budget Worksheet Form on Grants.gov).

On page 11584, section IV.B.7., first column, second bullet, is corrected by adding a new submission requirement after the second listed submission requirement:

Budget narrative (4-page maximum for applicant).

On page 11588, section V.A.2.c.(3), last sentence, second column, is corrected to read as follows:

Include a separate, detailed budget and budget narrative for any sub-grantee proposed to receive more than 10 percent of the total federal budget request.

14. Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program Coordinators

On page 11593, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 14, 2007. Please see the General Section for timely receipt requirements.

On page 11595, section IV.B.1, third column, after the first complete sentence, add the following sentence:

Applicants may satisfy this requirement to submit HUD–2991, Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan, by submitting a copy of the signed PHA Certification of Compliance for their current Annual PHA Plan.

15. Rural Housing and Economic Development (RHED) Program

On page 11601, Overview Information, section F., is revised to read as follows:

F. Application Date: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. Eastern time on the application deadline date. The validation process may take up to 72 hours.

16. ROSS—Elderly/Persons With Disabilities Program

On page 11611, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates. The application deadline date is August 10, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. Please note that validation may take up to 72 hours.

On page 11614, section III.C.1, second column, add the following section III.C.1.t.:

t. Program outreach to participants. When selecting this activity, applicants should use ''other'' in the Logic Model and then enter ''program outreach to participants.'' For the unit of measure, applicants should enter ''households'' in the dialogue box.

On page 11614, section III.C.2.a, third column, delete the following sentence:

Letters of commitment, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), or tribal resolutions must be on organization letterhead, and signed by a person authorized to make the stated commitment, whether it be in cash or in-kind services.

On page 11616, section III.C.4.c(3), second column, delete the following two sentences:

Joint applications involving nonprofit organizations must also provide evidence of resident support (the RA) or, if the RA is inactive, the RAB. (If the support letter is from the RAB, the applicant must also provide a support letter from the PHAs or tribes/TDHEs.)

17. ROSS Family and Homeownership Program

On page 11626, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates. The application deadline date is July 20, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. The validation process may take up to 72 hours.

On page 11628, section II.A.5., bottom of first column, the last complete sentence is revised to read as follows:

HUD expects to award a total of approximately $30,000,000 in ROSS Family and Homeownership grants in FY 2007.

On page 11629, section III.C.1.a., first column, first partial paragraph, delete ''* * *'' and add in its place '',Persons with Disabilities, the Elderly, Minorities, and Families with Limited English Proficiency.''

On page 11630, section III.C.1.b.(10), second column, delete ''program outreach'' from the list of administrative costs.

On page 11630, section III.C.1.b., third column, add the following section II.C.b.(11):

(11) Program outreach to participants. When selecting this activity, applicants should use ''other'' in the Logic Model and then enter ''program outreach to participants.'' For the unit of measure, applicants should enter ''households'' in the dialogue box.

On page 11630, section III.C.2.a., third column, delete the following sentence:

Letters of commitment, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), or tribal resolutions must be on organization letterhead, and signed by a person authorized to make the stated commitment, whether it be in cash or in-kind services.

On page 11632, section III.C.4.c., second column, in the unnumbered paragraph following the paragraph numbered c(3), delete the following sentence:

Joint applications involving nonprofit organizations must also provide evidence of resident support or support from local civic organizations or from units of local government.

On page 11634, section IV.E.3., first column, delete ''program outreach'' from the list of eligible administrative costs.

On page 11636, section V.A.1.c.(1)(a)(i), third column, is revised to read as follows:

(i) Involve community partners in the delivery of services (6 points);

An applicant will receive up to 6 points if the applicant narrative describes the involvement of partner organizations to deliver or support their proposed programs. An applicant will receive up to 3 points if the applicant narrative describes the existence of other community-based organizations in the area, but does not describe firm connections between program activities and the delivery or support of the proposed program. An applicant will receive 0 points if the applicant does not intend to involve any community partners in the delivery or support of their proposed program.

18. Public and Indian Housing Family Self-Sufficiency (PH FSS) Program Coordinators

On page 11643, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Application Deadline: The application deadline date is June 29, 2007. Please see the General Section for application submission, delivery, and timely receipt requirements.

19. Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program

On page 11650, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date for electronic submission and validation in Grants.gov is June 22, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. The validation process may take up to 72 hours.

On page 11654, section IV.C., first column, the first sentence is revised to read as follows:

The electronic application must be *received and validated* no later than 11:59:59 p.m. Eastern time by Grants.gov on the application deadline date, which is June 22, 2007.

On page 11656, section V.A., first column, under paragraph d. of the section labeled ''Submission Requirements for Rating Factor 3,'' revise the first complete sentence to read as follows:

State how the sales price for SHOP-assisted units is established, and demonstrate how the investment of SHOP funds, the contribution of sweat equity and volunteer labor, donations (e.g. land or building materials, etc.), in-kind contributions, and financing subsidies, reduces the average sales price to the homebuyer below the appraised value of the house or market value of comparable housing in the neighborhood.

On page 11659, section VI.A.1., second column, add the following section VI.A.1.c. before the final, unnumbered paragraph:

c. Fund less than the amount requested by any applicant after taking into consideration other amounts made available in FY 2007 to the applicant under the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program appropriation.

20. Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

On page 11662, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 14, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 eastern time on the application deadline date. The validation process may take up to 72 hours. Refer to the General Section for application submission and timely receipt requirements.

On page 11663, section II.A., first column, is revised to read as follows:

A. Total. The total available HOPWA competitive funding in FY 2007 is approximately $28,463,000. After first awarding funds to renew existing HOPWA permanent housing projects in FY 2007, HUD estimates that approximately $2.3 million will be available for new projects.

21. Assisted Living Conversion Program for Eligible Multifamily Projects

On page 11677, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. Eastern Time on June 20, 2007. See the General Section for specific instructions regarding application submission.

On page 11684, section IV.C., second column, is revised to read as follows:

C. Submission Date and Time

Application Submission Date. Unless you received a waiver to the electronic application submission requirements, your completed ALCP application must be submitted via *http://www.grants.gov/applicants/applyfor_grants.jsp* and must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 eastern time on the application deadline date (June 20, 2007). (Refer to Section IV. of the General Section for further instructions on the delivery and receipt of applications.

22. Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing

On page 11690, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 20, 2007. (All applications must be received and validated by *www.grants.gov* no later than 11:59:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the application deadline date. See submission details in the General Section.)

On page 11694, section IV.C., first column, is revised to read as follows:

C. Submission Dates and Times. The application deadline date is June 20, 2007. (All applications must be received and validated by *www.grants.gov* no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See submission details in the General Section.)

23. Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program

On page 11698, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 15, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic application submission and receipt requirements.

On page 11702, section III.C.2.b.(3)(c)(ii), third column, the last sentence is revised to read as follows:

In order for your application to be considered for review under this FY 2007 funding competition, the Phase II must be received by the local HUD office on or before July 16, 2007.

On page 11702, section III.C.2.b(3)(c)(iii), third column, the second to last sentence before the note is revised to read as follows:

In order for your application to be considered for review under this FY 2007 funding competition, this

information must be received by the local HUD office on or before July 16, 2007.

On page 11712, section V.A.1., first column, in the section heading delete ''(23 points)'' and replace with ''(25 points).''

On page 11712, section V.A.1.a., second column, delete ''(13 points)'' and replace with ''(15 points)''.

On page 11713, section V.A.3., second column, in the section heading, delete ''(47 points)'' and replace with ''(45 points)''.

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c., third column, delete ''(10 points)'' and replace with ''(8 points)''.

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c.(2)(a), third column, is revised to read as follows:

The neighborhood's percentage of persons of a particular racial or ethnic minority is at least 20 percentage points higher than the percentage of that particular racial or ethnic minority in the housing market area.

On page 11713, section V.A.3.c.(2)(b), third column, is revised to read as follows:

The neighborhood's total percentage of minority persons is at least 20 percentage points higher than the total percentage of minorities in the housing market area.

24. Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons With Disabilities

On page 11719, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: Application deadline date: June 21, 2007. Application must be received and validated by Grants.gov by 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the deadline date. Refer to Section IV. below and the General Section for information on application submission requirements.

On page 11724, section III.C.2.b.(3)(d)(ii), first column, the last sentence is revised to read as follows:

In order for your application to be considered as an application with site control, the Phase II must be received in the local HUD office on or before July 23, 2007.

On page 11724, section III.C.2.b.(3)(d)(iii), first column, the last sentence before the note is revised to read as follows:

In order for your application to be considered as an application with site control, this information must be received by the appropriate local HUD office on or before July 23, 2007.

On page 11740, section V.B.4.(c), first column, first full paragraph, delete the second and third sentences and replace with the following:

HUD headquarters will use these residual funds first to fund Way Station, Incorporated in the jurisdiction of the Baltimore, MD Multifamily Program Center, a FY 2006 application that was not funded due to an administrative error relative to the project size limit. Second, HUD Headquarters will use the residual funds to restore units to projects reduced by the HUD Multifamily Program Center or Multifamily Hub as a result of the instructions for using their residual funds. Third, HUD Headquarters will use these funds for selecting additional applications based on HUD Program Centers' rankings, beginning with the highest rated application nationwide in Category A.

On page 11740, section VI.C.1., third column, delete, ''Based on the information you provided in the Program Outcome Logic Model''.

25. The Early Doctoral Student Research Program and Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program

On page 11759, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 13, 2007. Applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov by the deadline date. Please be sure to read the General Section for electronic submission and receipt requirements.

On page 11760, section II.C.1., is revised to read as follows:

1. Eligible Activities. Grant funds awarded under this NOFA must be used to support direct costs incurred in the timely completion of the research product. Eligible costs include stipends, computer software, purchase of data, travel expenses to collect data, transcription services, and compensation for interviews. Indirect costs are not eligible costs.

26. Funding Availability for Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Assistance Programs

On page 11743, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: Applications must be submitted no later than June 15, 2007. Please see Section IV of this NOFA for application submission and timely receipt requirements.

On page 11751, section C.1., first column, revise the first complete sentence to read as follows:

Your completed application must be submitted on or before June 15, 2007 to the addresses shown below.

27. Housing Counseling Training

On page 11767, Overview Information, section F., first column, is revised to read as follows:

F. Dates: The application deadline date is June 14, 2007. Applications submitted through *http://www.grants.gov* must be received and validated by grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 p.m. eastern time on the application deadline date. See Section IV of the General Section, regarding application submission procedures and timely filing requirements.

Dated: May 8, 2007.

Keith A. Nelson,

Assistant Secretary for Administration.

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

Appendix A: Programs Included In The SuperNOFA	Funding Available (Approximate)	Application Deadline Date. (All applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 P.M. eastern time on the application deadline date. See submission details in General Section)
		For Deadline Date of:
Community Development Technical Assistance (CD-TA) Programs		
HOME TA	$10,000,000	6/22/2007
CFDA No.: 14.239		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0166		
CHDO (HOME) TA	$8,000,000	6/22/2007
CFDA No.: 14.239		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0166		
McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Programs TA	$6,500,000	6/22/2007
CFDA No.: 14.235		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0166		
HOPWA TA	$900,000	6/22/2007
CFDA No.: 14.241		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0133		
Indian Community Development Block Grant Program	$55,400,000	6/20/2007
Indian Community Development Block Grant Program (ICDBG)		
CFDA No.: 14.862		
OMB Approval No.: 2577-0191		
University and College Programs		
Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program (HBCU)	$8,900,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.520		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0235		
Hispanic-Serving Institutions Assisting Communities Program (HSIAC)	$6,011,226	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.514		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0198		
Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian Institutions Assisting Communities Program (AN/NHIAC)	$2,936,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.515		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0206		
Tribal Colleges and Universities Program (TCUP)	$2,700,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.519		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0215		

Appendix A: Programs Included In The SuperNOFA	Funding Available (Approximate)	Application Deadline Date. (All applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 P.M. eastern time on the application deadline date. See submission details in General Section)
Doctoral Programs:		
Early Doctoral Student Research Grant Program (EDSRG)	$105,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.517		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0216		
Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program (DDRG)	$300,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.516		
OMB Approval No.: 2528-0213		
Fair Housing Initiatives Program		
Fair Housing - Private Enforcement Initiative (PEI)	$14,000,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.408		
OMB Approval No.: 2529-0033		
Fair Housing Education and Outreach Initiative (EOI)	$4,100,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No.: 14.408		
OMB Approval No.: 2529-0033		
Housing Counseling Programs		
Housing Counseling Program		
Local Housing Counseling Agencies (LHCA)	$14,748,800	6/14/2007
National and Regional Intermediaries	$24,054,720	6/14/2007
Housing Counseling - State Housing Finance Agencies (SHFA)	$2,276,480	6/14/2007
CFDA No: 14.169		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0261		
Housing Counseling Training	$3,000,000	6/14/2007
CFDA No: 14.316		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0261		
Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control Programs		
Lead Hazard NOFA (Combined)		
Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program	$76,400,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.900		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant Program	$54,700,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.905		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Operation Lead Elimination Action Program (LEAP)	$17,300,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.903		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		

Appendix A: Programs Included In The SuperNOFA	Funding Available (Approximate)	Application Deadline Date. (All applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 P.M. eastern time on the application deadline date. See submission details in General Section)
Technical Studies NOFA (Combined)		
Lead-Technical Studies	$3,000,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.902		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Healthy Homes Technical Studies	$2,000,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.906		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Lead Outreach Grant Program	$2,000,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.904		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Healthy Homes Demonstration Program	$5,000,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.901		
OMB Approval No.: 2539-0015		
Economic Development and Self-Sufficiency Programs		
Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program Coordinators	$47,000,000	6/14/2007
CFDA No.: 14.871		
OMB Approval No.: 2577-0178		
Rural Housing & Economic Development (RHED)	$16,830,000	6/13/2007
CFDA No: 14.250		
OMB Approval No: 2506-0169		
ROSS Elderly/Persons with Disabilities	$20,000,000	8/10/2007
CFDA No.: 14.876		
OMB Approval No.: 2577-0229		
ROSS Family-Homeownership	$30,000,000	7/20/2007
CFDA No.: 14.870		
OMB Approval No.: 2577-0229		
Public and Indian Housing Family Self-Sufficiency	$12,000,000	6/29/2007
CFDA No.: 14.877		
OMB Approval No.: 2577-0229		
Targeted and Assisted Housing		
Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program (SHOP)	$19,800,000	6/22/2007
CFDA No: 14.247		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0157		
Housing Opportunities for Person with AIDS (HOPWA)	$2,300,000	6/14/2007
CFDA No.: 14.241		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0133		
Assisted-Living Conversion Program for Eligible Multifamily Projects	$30,000,000	6/20/2007
CFDA No.: 14.314		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0542		

Appendix A: Programs Included In The SuperNOFA	Funding Available (Approximate)	Application Deadline Date. (All applications must be received and validated by Grants.gov no later than 11:59:59 P.M. eastern time on the application deadline date. See submission details in General Section)
Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing	$51,600,000	6/20/2007
CFDA No.: 14.191		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0447		
Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly	$431,500,000	6/15/2007
CFDA No.: 14.157		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0267		
Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities	$88,300,000	6/21/2007
CFDA No.: 14.181		
OMB Approval No.: 2502-0462		
Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs	$1,250,000,000	6/15/2007
Supportive Housing Program (SHP)		
CFDA No.: 14.235		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0112		
Shelter Plus Care (S+C)		
CFDA No.: 14.238		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0112		
Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy Program for Homeless Individuals		
CFDA No.: 14.249		
OMB Approval No.: 2506-0112		

[FR Doc. 07–2337 Filed 5–8–07; 1:27 pm]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–C



Federal Register

Friday,
May 11, 2007

Part IV

Department of Housing and Urban Development

24 CFR Part 203
Standards for Mortgagor's Investment in Mortgaged Property; Proposed Rule

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR PART 203

[Docket No. FR–5087–P–01]

RIN 2502–AI52

Standards for Mortgagor's Investment in Mortgaged Property

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Through this proposed rule, HUD submits, for public comment, specific standards governing a mortgagor's investment in property for which the mortgage is insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Specifically, this proposed rule would codify HUD's longstanding practice, authorized by statute, of allowing a mortgagor's investment to be derived from gifts by family members and certain organizations.

The standards would address a situation in which the mortgagor's investment is derived from a gift, loan, or other payment that is provided by any donor, including an individual or an organization, and would also specify prohibited sources for a mortgagor's investment. The proposed rule would establish that a prohibited source of downpayment assistance is a payment that consists, in whole or in part, of funds provided by any of the following parties before, during, or after closing of the property sale: (1) The seller, or any other person or entity that financially benefits from the transaction; or (2) any third party or entity that is reimbursed directly or indirectly by any of the parties listed in clause (1).

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* July 10, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this rule to the Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Room 10276, Washington, DC 20410–0500. Communications should refer to the above docket number and title.

Comment by Mail. Please note that due to security measures at all federal agencies, submission of comments by mail often results in delayed delivery.

Electronic Submission of Comments. HUD now accepts comments electronically. Interested persons may now submit comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *www.regulations.gov*. HUD strongly encourages commenters to submit comments electronically. Electronic submission of comments allows the commenter maximum time to prepare and submit a comment, ensures timely receipt by HUD, and enables HUD to make them immediately available for public viewing. Commenters should follow the instructions provided at *www.regulations.gov* to submit comments electronically.

No Facsimile Comments. Facsimile (Fax) comments are not acceptable. In all cases, communications must refer to the docket number and title.

Public Inspection of Public Comments. All comments and communications submitted will be available, without revision, for inspection and downloading at *www.regulations.gov.* Comments are also available for public inspection and copying between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays at the Office of Regulations. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, please schedule an appointment to review the comments by calling the Regulations Division at (202) 708–3055 (this is not a toll-free number).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Beavers, Acting Director, Office of Single Family Program Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708–2121 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In order for a mortgage to be eligible for insurance by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)(9)) requires the mortgagor (with narrow exceptions) to pay on account of the property at least 3 percent of the cost of acquisition. The statute and the implementing regulation at 24 CFR 203.19 are silent about permissible or impermissible sources of the mortgagor's investment, except that some loans are permitted sources under the statute. For example, section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act permits family members to provide loans to other family members, and permits the mortgagor's downpayment to be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor in certain circumstances, such as when the mortgagor is 60 years of age or older, or when the mortgage covers a housing unit in a homeownership program under the Homeownership and Opportunity through HOPE Act (Title IV of Pub. L. 101–625, 104 Stat. 4148, approved November 28, 1990).

In a 1999 proposed rule, HUD addressed the subject of prohibited sources of downpayment assistance. At that time, downpayment assistance from seller-funded or reimbursed charitable organizations was a matter of concern to HUD. (See HUD's proposed rule published on September 14, 1999, 64 FR 49956.) In 2001, HUD withdrew the 1999 proposed rule. (See January 12, 2001, notice of withdrawal of proposed rule at 66 FR 2851.) The matter, however, remains of concern to HUD. Gifts for homeowners' downpayments from charitable organizations have continued to raise concerns in those cases in which the seller, or any party that financially benefits from the transaction, contributes funds to the mortgagor's downpayment. A party that might benefit from the transaction may be a family member of the seller, a real estate agent, or a broker.

Although FHA has attempted to preclude downpayment funding derived from contributions of the seller of the property, some charitable organizations have been able to circumvent these restrictions in various ways, including the establishment of a fund that provides the so-called ''gift'' to the homebuyer. The situations that cause FHA concern are primarily those in which the fund is replenished after loan closing by the seller who provides a ''charitable donation'' and, in some cases, pays a ''service fee'' to the organization from the proceeds of the sale of the house and does so only if the homebuyer is using the charitable organization's downpayment assistance program. In these cases, there is a clear *quid pro quo* between the homebuyer's purchase of the property and the seller's ''contribution'' or payment to the charitable organization. This is also true if the contribution to the charitable organization comes from an entity other than the seller that has an expectation of being reimbursed by the seller. Often, these contributions function as an inducement to purchase the home.

FHA's primary concern with these transactions is that the sales price is often increased to ensure that the seller's net proceeds are not diminished, and such increase in sales price is often to the detriment of the borrower and FHA. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report released in 2005 entitled ''Mortgage Financing Actions Need to Help FHA Manage Risks from New Loan Products'' (GAO Mortgage Financing Report) stated that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac do not allow

seller-related contributions to the downpayment, and that seller-related contributions could contribute to an overvaluation of the price of the property (GAO Mortgage Financing Report at page 16).

In May 2006, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) addressed these same concerns by issuing Revenue Ruling 2006–27, which provides guidelines on organizations that may provide downpayment assistance to homebuyers and qualify as tax-exempt charitable or educational organizations under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) section 501(c)(3), and those that do not qualify for this tax-exempt status. The IRS, in its press announcement of the ruling, stated that funneling downpayment assistance from sellers to buyers through ''self-serving, circular-financing arrangements'' is inconsistent with operation as a section 501(c)(3) charitable organization. The IRS stated that, in a typical scheme, there is a direct correlation between the amount of the downpayment assistance provided to the buyer and the payment received from the seller, the seller pays the organization only if the sale closes, and the organization usually charges an additional fee for its services. The IRS noted that so-called charities that manipulate the system do more than mislead honest homebuyers; these organizations ultimately cause an increase in the cost of the home and damage the image of honest, legitimate charities. (See IRS News Release of May 4, 2006, at *http://www.irs.gov/newsroom/article/0,id=156675,00.html*.)

As the IRS also noted in its press release, inflated sales prices are often found on properties purchased with downpayment assistance from seller-funded nonprofit programs. Unlike true gifts that reduce the amount of the purchase price financed by the homeowner, such seller contributions increase the sales price of the home and result in higher mortgage payments. As noted by the revenue ruling, inflated sales prices result in inflated mortgage amounts, which increase the severity of individual claims on the FHA Insurance Fund and FHA losses on claims paid on such mortgages. Given that seller-funded gift programs thrive in stagnant or depreciating housing markets, the risk to FHA increases if FHA cannot recover the full amount owed when FHA acquires and resells a home that had been purchased by a participating borrower who had defaulted on the FHA-insured loan.

This Proposed Rule

This proposed rule would codify standards regarding the use of gifts as a source of the mortgagor's investment in the mortgaged property, and would also specify prohibited sources for a mortgagor's investment. Permissible sources of gifts as a source of the mortgagor's investment include a family member, a governmental or public agency, the borrower's employer or labor union, and a charitable organization that qualifies as a tax-exempt charitable or educational organization under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC of 1986. The proposed rule would establish that a prohibited source of downpayment assistance is a payment that consists, in whole or in part, of funds provided by any of the following parties before, during, or after closing of the property sale: (1) The seller, or any other person or entity that financially benefits from the transaction; or (2) any third party or entity (referred to as a ''donor'') that is reimbursed directly or indirectly by any of the parties listed in clause (1). The use of the term ''indirectly'' in this proposed rule precludes the seller from providing the donor with funds through an individual or organization other than the seller, such as a family member of the seller. The use of the term ''financially benefits'' in this proposed rule is intended to capture, for example, real estate agents or real estate brokers who would benefit from the sale of the home to the mortgagor. The concern is that the problems with seller-funded contributions, as described earlier in this preamble, exist regardless of the route by which the funds are provided to the mortgagor.

A prohibited source of downpayment assistance, as defined in this rule, would apply to sales of existing homes by private sellers as well as sales by builders, developers, and others involved in new construction, or any party that financially benefits from the transaction. HUD would not allow any form of downpayment assistance, in any of its programs, if the downpayment assistance is derived, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, from prohibited funds as described in this rule.

While the proposed rule is intended to prevent sellers from funding downpayments in their own home sales transactions, the proposed rule is not intended to preclude sellers from contributing to charitable organizations, which are often sources of donor downpayment assistance, that provide downpayment assistance that is unrelated in any manner to any properties sold by the seller. In addition, the rule is not intended to preclude reasonable assistance with closing costs not related to the minimum investment, which may be permitted under local practice. Nothing in this rule proposes to change HUD's policy of allowing builders and other sellers to offer cash incentives to homebuyers, provided that any cash or cash equivalent given to a homebuyer before, at, or after closing results in a proportionate reduction to the mortgage; an amount which the homebuyer then would have to provide as additional funds at closing. The primary focus of this rule is to establish appropriate standards for downpayment assistance to a homebuyer that is categorized as a gift.

HUD currently requires that the gift to the borrower that is to serve as an investment in the property to be purchased must be documented in writing. The lender must document the gift funds through a letter signed by the donor and the borrower specifying, among other things, information about the donor, that no repayment by the borrower is required, and describing the relationship between the donor and the borrower. This proposed rule does not propose to change these current practices. Therefore, given the continued concerns about gifts based on seller-funded contributions, this rule proposes the following regulatory changes to 24 CFR 203.19.

HUD's current regulation of the mortgagor's minimum payment requirement is found at 24 CFR 203.19. As proposed to be revised by this rule, § 203.19 would have the following organization:

Paragraph (a) would require a mortgagor to have the funds needed to complete the transaction (payment of purchase price and settlement costs) in addition to the funds provided by the insured mortgage. This basic policy was previously stated only in a handbook rather than a regulation, but it is a basic requirement of mortgage lending and does not represent a new substantive policy.

Paragraph (b) would correspond with the first part of section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act by stating the basic rule for a 3 percent mortgagor cash investment. The statute and the current regulation give HUD the discretion to require more than 3 percent, but it is no longer necessary to reserve this discretion in regulations. In practice, HUD has not required more than 3 percent, except as needed to satisfy the basic requirement for cash sufficient to close the transaction (as stated in proposed new paragraph (a)). Both the statute and the current regulation exempt the following from the 3 percent requirement: (1) Veterans who can qualify under section 203(b)(2) of the

National Housing Act and (2) disaster victims who can qualify for 100 percent mortgage financing under section 203(h) of the National Housing Act. However, HUD's current regulation in § 203.19(a)(2) imposes a $200 minimum cash investment requirement for those mortgagors. That $200 requirement is no longer meaningful in relation to vast increases in home values and mortgage amounts since the $200 requirement was adopted, and HUD proposes to delete it from the regulations in the interest of simplifying mortgage processing.

Paragraph (c) of the proposed rule would establish prohibited sources of downpayment assistance, as discussed in this preamble. HUD, however, has recognized local market practices in which sellers customarily agree to pay some of the buyer's closing costs. Beginning in the mid-1980's, HUD's administrative policies reflected in mortgagee letters and handbooks have permitted some seller contributions, consistent with local market practices that would be reflected in local appraisal practices, but never more than 6 percent of the purchase price. Proposed paragraph (c) will not prohibit reasonable seller contributions to closing costs.

Paragraph (d) would state the general policy that funds from loans or gifts may not be used for any part of the mortgagor's minimum investment, unless otherwise permitted by the rule.

Paragraph (e), like current § 203.19(b), would identify certain loan sources authorized by statute. The paragraph would clearly state HUD's historical understanding of the congressional intent behind section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act, which is that loans are a forbidden source of the 3 percent minimum investment unless a statute provides otherwise.

Paragraph (e) would also include certain statutory authorizations on which HUD relies, but which are currently not stated or referenced in regulations (family loans and government loan programs). Although paragraph (e) would restrict only the use of loans for the 3 percent minimum cash investment and would not apply to the rest of the required investment, it is important to note that 24 CFR 203.32 contains restrictions on secondary financing that is unsecured or secured by the home. Paragraph (e) would not supersede § 203.32.

Finally, paragraph (f) would list the limited permissible sources of gifts.

Findings and Certifications

Regulatory Planning and Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reviewed this rule under Executive Order 12866, *Regulatory Planning and Review.* OMB determined that this rule is a ''significant regulatory action,'' as defined in section 3(f) of the Order (although not an economically significant regulatory action under the Order). The docket file is available for public inspection in the Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel, Room 10276, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410–0500. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, please schedule an appointment to review the docket file by calling the Regulations Division at (202) 708–3055 (this is not a toll-free number).

Environmental Review

A Finding of No Significant Impact is not required for this proposed rule. Under 24 CFR 50.19(b)(6), this proposed rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements, unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The purpose of this rule, as noted in the preamble, is to establish standards regarding the use of gifts by borrowers with an FHA-insured mortgage—primarily standards that would address gifts by charitable organizations—as a source of an FHA mortgagor's investment in the mortgaged property. To date, HUD's practice has been to limit permissible sources of gifts to family members, governmental agencies, employer of the mortgagor, labor union of the mortgagor, or charitable organizations. HUD is not narrowing the sources of gifts through this rulemaking but rather striving to ensure that gifts are gifts and that especially in the situation of gifts from charitable organizations, the gift is not a *quid pro quo* between the homebuyer's purchase of the property and the seller's ''contribution'' or payment to the charitable organization.

The prohibited sources of downpayment assistance, as structured in this proposed rule, are narrow and should not encompass a substantial number of small entities that are engaged in downpayment assistance to homebuyers, which, to date, have primarily been charitable organizations with tax-exempt status.

As noted earlier in this preamble, the IRS, in Revenue Ruling 2006–27, has ruled that an organization that relies ''on sellers and other real-estate related businesses that stand to benefit from the transaction'' to finance downpayment assistance provided as part of the same transaction does not qualify as charitable organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRC. Organizations that meet the criteria of section 501(c)(3) qualify for exemption from federal income taxation pursuant to IRC section 501(a). HUD's proposed rulemaking will not have any significant economic impact on small entities that qualify as charitable organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRC and are exempt from tax under section 501(a) of the IRC because existing law prevents those organizations from providing seller-financed downpayment assistance while maintaining their tax-exempt status.

The IRS ruling also describes two organizations that provide downpayment assistance and qualify as charitable organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRC and are exempt from tax under section 501(a) of the IRC. These organizations do not accept contributions from sellers that are contingent upon the sale of the seller's property. They follow additional policies and procedures that ensure that any benefit to sellers or other parties with an interest in selling homes is incidental to any transaction in which the charitable organization provides downpayment assistance. The organizations will accept contributions from property sellers, but only if the contributions are not contingent on the sale of the seller's property or a *quid pro quo* for the sale of the property. HUD's proposed rule permits downpayment assistance to be provided by section 501(c)(3) organizations in a manner consistent with the IRS ruling.

Charitable organizations, large or small, remain eligible to provide downpayment assistance to FHA mortgagors, subject to meeting the requirements of § 203.19, as proposed to be revised by this rule. HUD's proposed rule does not preclude gifts from charitable organizations that provide housing assistance in a manner that is consistent with operation for exclusively charitable purposes.

Accordingly, the undersigned certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Notwithstanding this determination, small entities are specifically invited to comment on whether this proposed rule will significantly affect them, and to make any recommendations on alternatives for compliance with the requirements of this rule. Comments should be submitted in accordance with the instructions in the **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** sections in the preamble of this proposed rule.

Executive Order 12612, Federalism

The General Counsel, as the Designated Official under section 6(a) of Executive Order 12612, *Federalism,* has determined that this proposed rule would not have ''federalism implications'' because it does not have substantial direct effects on the states (including their political subdivisions), or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. This proposed rule solely addresses requirements under HUD's FHA mortgage insurance programs.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4, approved March 22, 1995) established requirements for federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on state, local, and tribal governments, and the private sector. This proposed rule does not impose any federal mandates on any state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector within the meaning of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for the principal FHA single-family mortgage insurance program is 14.117. This proposed rule would also apply through cross-referencing to FHA mortgage insurance for condominium units (14.133), and other smaller single-family programs.

List of Subjects in 24 CFR Part 203

Loan programs—housing and community development, Mortgage insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, the Department proposes to amend 24 CFR part 203, as follows:

PART 203—SINGLE FAMILY MORTGAGE INSURANCE

1. The authority citation for part 203 continues to read:

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 1709, 1710, 1715b, 1715z–16, and 1715u; 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

2. Section 203.19 is revised to read as follows:

§ 203.19 Mortgagor's investment in the property.

(a) *Required funds.* The mortgagor must have available funds equal to the difference between:

(1) The cost of acquisition, which is the sum of the purchase price of the home and settlement costs acceptable to the Secretary; and

(2) The amount of the insured mortgage.

(b) *Mortgagor's minimum cash investment.* The required funds under paragraph (a) of this section must include an investment in the property by the mortgagor, in cash or cash equivalent, equal to at least 3 percent of the cost of acquisition as determined by the Secretary, unless the mortgagor is:

(1) A veteran meeting the requirements of § 203.18(b); or

(2) A disaster victim meeting the requirements of § 203.18(e).

(c) *Restrictions on seller funding.* Notwithstanding paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section, the funds required by paragraph (a) of this section shall not consist, in whole or in part, of funds provided by any of the following parties before, during, or after closing of the property sale:

(1) The seller or any other person or entity that financially benefits from the transaction; or

(2) Any third party or entity that is reimbursed, directly or indirectly, by any of the parties described in paragraph (c)(1) of this section.

(d) *Gifts and loans usually prohibited for minimum cash investment.* A mortgagor may not use funds for any part of the minimum cash investment under paragraph (b) of this section if the funds were obtained through a loan or a gift from any person, except as provided in paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section, respectively.

(e) *Permissible sources of loans.*

(1) *Statutory authorization needed.* A statute must authorize a loan as a source of the mortgagor's minimum cash investment under paragraph (b) of this section.

(2) *Examples.* The following loans are authorized by statute as a source for the minimum investment:

(i) A loan from a family member, a loan to a mortgagor who is at least 60 years old when the mortgage is accepted for insurance, or a loan that is otherwise expressly authorized by section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act;

(ii) A loan made or held by, or insured by, a federal, state, or local government agency or instrumentality under terms and conditions approved by the Secretary; and

(iii) A federal disaster relief loan.

(f) *Permissible sources of gifts.* The following are permissible sources of gifts or grants used for the mortgagor's minimum investment under paragraph (b) of this section:

(1) Family members and governmental agencies and instrumentalities eligible under paragraphs (e)(2)(i) and (ii) of this section;

(2) An employer or labor union of the mortgagor;

(3) Charitable organizations exempt from taxation under section 501(a), pursuant to section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, subject to paragraph (c) of this section;

(4) Disaster relief grants; and

(5) Other sources as may be approved by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis.

Dated: April 13, 2007.

Brian D. Montgomery,

Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. E7–9067 Filed 5–10–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 72, No. 91

Friday, May 11, 2007

CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations	
General Information, indexes and other finding aids	**202–741–6000**
Laws	**741–6000**
Presidential Documents	
Executive orders and proclamations	**741–6000**
The United States Government Manual	**741–6000**
Other Services	
Electronic and on-line services (voice)	**741–6020**
Privacy Act Compilation	**741–6064**
Public Laws Update Service (numbers, dates, etc.)	**741–6043**
TTY for the deaf-and-hard-of-hearing	**741–6086**

ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List, indexes, and links to GPO Access are located at: **http://www.archives.gov/federal_register**

E-mail

FEDREGTOC-L (Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **http://listserv.access.gpo.gov** and select *Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

PENS (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html** and select *Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

FEDREGTOC-L and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

Reference questions. Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, MAY

23761–24176 1
24177–24522 2
24523–25188 3
25189–25676 4
25677–25944 7
25945–26280 8
26281–26532 9
26533–26708 10
26709–27052 11

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING MAY

At the end of each month, the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

3 CFR

Proclamations:
8133 24173
8134 24175
8135 24177
8136 25181
8137 25183
8138 25185
8139 25187
8140 26705
Executive Orders:
13338 (See Notice of May 8, 2007 26707
13399 (See Notice of May 8, 2007 26707
13431 26709
Administrative Orders:
Presidential Determinations:
No. 2007–17 of April 25, 2007 26281
Notices:
Notice of May 8, 2007 26707

5 CFR

Ch. LXIV 26533
Proposed Rules:
315 23772
752 23772

7 CFR

210 24179
220 24179
225 24179
226 24179
246 24179
247 24179
251 24179
319 26711
457 24523
916 25945
917 25945
959 25677
966 24530
982 23761
Proposed Rules:
810 23775
925 24551
929 23777
930 24553
955 25207
1000 25986
1001 25986
1005 25986
1006 25986
1007 25986
1030 25986
1032 25986
1033 25986
1124 25986
1126 25986
1131 25986
1210 26005
1738 26742

9 CFR

205 25947
Proposed Rules:
381 26567

10 CFR

72 26535
Proposed Rules:
72 26568

11 CFR

Proposed Rules:
106 26569

12 CFR

509 25948
585 25948

13 CFR

120 25189

14 CFR

39 ..... 23765, 25957, 25960, 26283, 26285, 26538, 26711, 26714, 26716
71 ..... 23767, 23768, 25962, 25963, 26287
97 23769
121 26540
135 26540
Proposed Rules:
1 25207
33 25207
39 26008
71 25712

15 CFR

705 25194
730 25194
736 25194
744 25194
747 25194
754 25194
756 25194
760 25194
766 25194
768 25194
770 25194
772 ..... 25194, 25680
774 25680

16 CFR

Proposed Rules:
259 26328

18 CFR

Proposed Rules:
35 23778

19 CFR

123.....25965

21 CFR

510.....24184, 26288
520.....24185
529.....26289
866.....26290
1308.....24532
Proposed Rules:
878.....26011

24 CFR

Proposed Rules:
203.....27048
320.....25926
350.....25926
983.....24080

26 CFR

1.....23771, 26542
602.....24678
Proposed Rules:
1 .....24192, 26011, 26012, 26576, 26689

28 CFR

Proposed Rules:
16.....26037

30 CFR

202.....24448
203.....25197
206.....24448
210.....24448
217.....24448
218.....24448
250.....25197
251.....25197
260.....25197
935.....26291
Proposed Rules
946.....26329

32 CFR

Proposed Rules:
216.....25713
571.....26576

33 CFR

100 .....25202, 25685, 25966
117.....24534, 25203
165 .....23771, 24185, 24534, 25686, 25966, 26296, 26298
Proposed Rules:
100.....25214
117.....26038
165 .....23779, 23781, 24196, 25217, 25219, 25226, 25720

34 CFR

Proposed Rules:
200.....25228
303.....26456

36 CFR

242.....25688
Proposed Rules:
261.....26578
1193.....26580
1194.....26580

37 CFR

380.....24084

38 CFR

Proposed Rules:
1.....25930
14.....25930
19.....25930
20.....25930

39 CFR

111.....26543

40 CFR

9.....24496, 26544
35.....24496
49.....25698
51.....24060
52 .....24060, 25203, 25967, 25969, 25971, 25973, 25975, 26718
62.....25978
63.....25138, 25980
70.....24060
71.....24060
80.....23900
81.....25967, 26718
174.....26300
180 .....24188, 26304, 26310, 26317, 26322
372.....26544
Proposed Rules:
51.....24472, 26202
52 .....23783, 25241, 26040, 26045, 26046, 26057, 26202, 26581, 26759
62.....26069
63.....26069
81 .....23783, 26046, 26057, 26581, 26759
93.....24472
122.....26582
141.....24016
180.....24198
412.....26582

41 CFR

Proposed Rules:
101-42.....25723
101-45.....25723
102-40.....25723

42 CFR

412.....26870
413.....26870
Proposed Rules:
411.....24680
412.....24680, 26230
413.....24680, 25526
418.....24116
484.....25356, 26887
489.....24680

43 CFR

3000.....24358
3200.....24358
3280.....24358

47 CFR

15.....26554
73.....24190, 24191
Proposed Rules:
1.....24213
27.....24238
73.....26331, 26332

48 CFR

1804.....26560
1852.....26560
3001.....24536
3002.....24536
3033.....24536
Proposed Rules:
12.....24554
23.....24554
42.....24554
52.....24554

49 CFR

107.....24536
171.....25162
172.....25162
173.....25162
175.....25162
176.....25162
571.....25484
585.....25484

50 CFR

100.....25688
223.....26722
635.....26735
648 .....25709, 26325, 26563
660.....24539
Proposed Rules:
17.....24253
648.....25735, 26770
665.....26771

REMINDERS

The items in this list were editorially compiled as an aid to Federal Register users. Inclusion or exclusion from this list has no legal significance.

RULES GOING INTO EFFECT MAY 11, 2007

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Plant-related quarantine, foreign:

Cut flowers from countries with chrysanthemum white rust; published 5-11-07

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Fish and seafood promotion:

Seafood-specific seafood marketing councils; establishment and operation; published 4-11-07

Fishery conservation and management:

Atlantic highly migratory species—

Atlantic billfish; tournament management measures; published 5-11-07

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Coast Guard

Ports and waterways safety; regulated navigation areas, safety zones, security zones, etc.:

Jamestown Island, VA; published 4-23-07

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Aviation Administration

Airworthiness directives:

Learjet; published 4-26-07

RULES GOING INTO EFFECT MAY 12, 2007

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Coast Guard

Ports and waterways safety; regulated navigation areas, safety zones, security zones, etc.:

Appomattox River, Hopewell, VA; published 4-3-07

Regattas and marine parades:

Baltimore County Community Waterfront Festival; published 4-11-07

COMMENTS DUE NEXT WEEK

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Food and Nutrition Service

Food stamp program:

Bonding requirements for violating retailers and wholesalers; revisions; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-13-07 [FR E7-04520]

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Commerce debt collection; non-tax debts collection procedures; comments due by 5-16-07; published 4-16-07 [FR E7-06699]

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Fishery conservation and management:

Caribbean, Gulf, and South Atlantic fisheries—

Vermilion snapper; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-27-07 [FR E7-08116]

Northeastern United States fisheries—

Atlantic sea scallop; comments due by 5-18-07; published 3-19-07 [FR E7-04882]

West Coast States and Western Pacific fisheries—

Highly migratory species; vessel identification requirements; comments due by 5-18-07; published 4-18-07 [FR E7-07381]

Pacific Coast groundfish; comments due by 5-18-07; published 4-18-07 [FR 07-01917]

Western Pacific fisheries—

Bigeye and yellowfin tuna; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-29-07 [FR E7-05825]

Marine mammals:

Sea turtle conservation—

Atlantic trawl fisheries; turtle excluder devices requirements; comments due by 5-18-07; published 3-19-07 [FR E7-04884]

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Flammable Fabrics Act:

Clothing textiles; flammability standards; comments due by 5-14-07; published 2-27-07 [FR 07-00779]

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):

Approved attorneys, abstracters, and title companies; list; comments due by 5-15-07; published 3-16-07 [FR 07-01182]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Air pollutants, hazardous; national emission standards:

Iron and steel foundries; comments due by 5-17-07; published 4-17-07 [FR E7-07203]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning purposes; designation of areas:

Virginia; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-13-07 [FR E7-07017]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning purposes; designation of areas:

Indiana; comments due by 5-18-07; published 4-18-07 [FR E7-07347]

Ohio; comments due by 5-18-07; published 4-18-07 [FR E7-07352]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States:

Tennessee; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-06717]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning purposes; designation of areas:

Virginia; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-07018]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States; air quality planning purposes; designation of areas

Virginia; correction; comments due by 5-14-07; published 5-10-07 [FR E7-09010]

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States:

Wisconsin; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-06727]

Grants; State and local assistance:

Clean Water Act Section 106 grants; permit fee incentive; allotment formula; comments due by 5-14-07; published 1-4-07 [FR E6-22549]

Pesticides; tolerances in food, animal feeds, and raw agricultural commodities:

Tribenuron methyl; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-14-07 [FR E7-04645]

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

Federal home loan bank system:

Appointive directors; financial interests; comments due by 5-17-07; published 4-2-07 [FR E7-05973]

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):

Approved attorneys, abstracters, and title companies; list; comments due by 5-15-07; published 3-16-07 [FR 07-01182]

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Food and Drug Administration

Human and animal drugs:

Cattle material; prohibited use in medical products for humans and drugs intended for use in ruminants; comments due by 5-14-07; published 1-12-07 [FR E6-22329]

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Coast Guard

Ports and waterways safety; regulated navigation areas, safety zones, security zones, etc.:

Bailey's Harbor, WI; comments due by 5-17-07; published 5-2-07 [FR E7-08445]

Beverly Harbor, Beverly, MA; comments due by 5-16-07; published 4-16-07 [FR E7-07177]

Marblehead Harbor, MA; comments due by 5-16-07; published 4-16-07 [FR E7-07185]

Weymouth Fore River, MA; comments due by 5-16-07; published 4-16-07 [FR E7-07189]

Regattas and marine parades:

Watermen's Heritage Festival Workboat Races;

comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-06943]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Fish and Wildlife Service

Endangered and threatened species:

Critical habitat designations—

San Diego thornmint; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-14-07 [FR 07-01100]

Migratory bird hunting:

Alaska; 2007-08 spring/summer subsistence harvest regulations; Indian Tribal proposals and requests; comments due by 5-15-07; published 4-11-07 [FR 07-01750]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office

Surface coal mining and reclamation operations:

Coal combustion byproducts; placement in active and abandoned coal mines; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-14-07 [FR E7-04669]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress

Noncommercial educational broadcasting; copyrighted works use; statutory license rates and terms; comments due by 5-17-07; published 4-17-07 [FR E7-07067]

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):

Approved attorneys, abstracters, and title companies; list; comments due by 5-15-07; published 3-16-07 [FR 07-01182]

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Reduction in force:

Retention; representative rate, order of release from competitive level and assignment rights; clarification; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-15-07 [FR E7-04701]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Securities:

Broker-dealers; financial responsibility rules; comments due by 5-18-07; published 3-19-07 [FR E7-04693]

SPECIAL COUNSEL OFFICE

Office of the Special Counsel

Freedom of Information Act; implementation; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-06774]

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Aviation Administration

Airworthiness directives:

Air Tractor, Inc.; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-15-07 [FR E7-04737]

Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc.; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-13-07 [FR E7-04525]

Boeing; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-29-07 [FR E7-05667]

Dassault; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-12-07 [FR E7-06932]

Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH; comments due by 5-14-07; published 4-13-07 [FR E7-07050]

Eurocopter France; comments due by 5-14-07; published 3-13-07 [FR 07-01167]

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

This is a continuing list of public bills from the current session of Congress which have become Federal laws. It may be used in conjunction with ''P L U S'' (Public Laws Update Service) on 202–741–6043. This list is also available online at *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/laws.html*.

The text of laws is not published in the **Federal Register** but may be ordered in ''slip law'' (individual pamphlet) form from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (phone, 202–512–1808). The text will also be made available on the Internet from GPO Access at *http://www.gpoaccess.gov/plaws/index.html*. Some laws may not yet be available.

S. 521/P.L. 110–25

To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the ''Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse''. (May 8, 2007; 121 Stat. 102)

Last List May 8, 2007

Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

PENS is a free electronic mail notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html*

Note: This service is strictly for E-mail notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.