

6. What kinds of non-profit entities currently exist in the marketplace that could potentially fulfill the role of an “applicable reinsurance entity” as defined in the Act?

7. What methods are typically used to determine which individuals are deemed high-risk or high cost for the purposes of reinsurance?

8. What challenges are States likely to face in implementing the temporary reinsurance program?

9. How do other programs (e.g., Medicaid) use risk corridors to share profits and losses with health plans or other entities? How are the corridors defined and monitored under these programs? What mechanisms are used to collect and disburse payments?

10. Are there non-Federal instances in which reinsurance and/or risk corridors and/or risk adjustment were used together? What kinds of special considerations are important when implementing multiple risk selection mitigation strategies at once?

*M. Comments Regarding Economic Analysis, Paperwork Reduction Act, and Regulatory Flexibility Act*

Executive Order 12866 requires an assessment of the anticipated costs and benefits of a significant rulemaking action and the alternatives considered, using the guidance provided by the Office of Management and Budget. These costs and benefits are not limited to the Federal government, but pertain to the affected public as a whole. Under Executive Order 12866, a determination must be made whether implementation of the Exchange-related provisions in Title I of the Affordable Care Act will be economically significant. A rule that has an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more is considered economically significant.

In addition, the Regulatory Flexibility Act may require the preparation of an analysis of the economic impact on small entities of proposed rules and regulatory alternatives. An analysis under the Regulatory Flexibility Act must generally include, among other things, an estimate of the number of small entities subject to the regulations (for this purpose, plans, employers, and in some contexts small governmental entities), the expense of the reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements (including the expense of using professional expertise), and a description of any significant regulatory alternatives considered that would accomplish the stated objectives of the

statute and minimize the impact on small entities.

The Paperwork Reduction Act requires an estimate of how many “respondents” will be required to comply with any “collection of information” requirements contained in regulations and how much time and cost will be incurred as a result. A collection of information includes recordkeeping, reporting to governmental agencies, and third-party disclosures.

Furthermore, Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) requires that agencies assess anticipated costs and benefits and take certain other actions before issuing a final rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in expenditure in any one year by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$135 million.

The Department is requesting comments that may contribute to the analyses that will be performed under these requirements, both generally and with respect to the following specific areas:

1. What policies, procedures, or practices of plans, employers and States may be impacted by the Exchange-related provisions in Title I of the Affordable Care Act?

a. What direct or indirect costs and benefits would result?

b. Which stakeholders will be affected by such benefits and costs?

c. Are these impacts likely to vary by insurance market, plan type, or geographic area?

2. Are there unique effects for small entities subject to the Exchange-related provisions in Title I of the Affordable Care Act?

3. Are there unique benefits and costs affecting consumers? How will these consumer benefits be affected by States’ Exchange design and flexibilities and the magnitude and substance of provisions mandated by the Act? Please discuss tangible and intangible benefits.

4. Are there paperwork burdens related to the Exchange-related provisions in Title I of the Affordable Care Act, and, if so, what estimated hours and costs are associated with those additional burdens?

*N. Comments Regarding Exchange Operations*

The Exchange-related provisions in Title I of the Affordable Care Act may affect/will involve various stakeholders. HHS wants to ensure receipt of all

comments pertaining to the operations of the Exchanges.

1. What other considerations related to the operations of Exchanges should be addressed? If your questions related to the operations of Exchanges have not been asked, or you would like to add additional comments, you may do so here.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 27th day of July 2010.

**Jay Angoff,**

*Director, Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Department of Health and Human Services.*

[FR Doc. 2010–18924 Filed 7–29–10; 11:15 am]

**BILLING CODE 4150–65–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 1

[WC Docket No. 07–245, GN Docket No. 09–51; FCC 10–84]

### Implementation of Section 224 of the Act; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** on July 15, 2010, with respect to attachments to poles by any telecommunications carrier or cable operator providing telecommunications services. Specifically, this corrects how the maximum just and reasonable rate would be calculated under proposed rule § 1.1409(e)(2).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marvin Sacks, 202–418–2017.

### Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. 2010–17048, beginning on page 41338 in the issue of July 15, 2010, make the following corrections in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section. On page 41361 in the third column, under the proposed formula in § 1.1409(e)(2)(ii), delete the word “Maximum” before the word “Rate” and add the words “Maintenance and Administrative” before the words “Carrying Charge Rate,” so the formula reads as follows:

Federal Communications Commission.

**Bulah P. Wheeler,**

*Deputy Manager.*

$$\text{Rate} = \text{Space Factor} \times \text{Net Cost of a Bare Pole} \times \left[ \frac{\text{Maintenance and Administrative Carrying Charge Rate}}{\text{Pole Height}} \right]$$

$$\text{Where Space Factor} = \left[ \frac{\left( \frac{\text{Space Occupied}}{\text{Pole Height}} \right) + \left( \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{\text{Unusable Space}}{\text{No. of Attaching Entities}} \right)}{\text{Pole Height}} \right]$$

[FR Doc. 2010-18908 Filed 8-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PHMSA-2009-0203]

#### Pipeline Safety: Notice of Technical Pipeline Safety Advisory Committee Meetings

**AGENCY:** Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA); DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of technical pipeline safety advisory committee meetings.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a public meeting of the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee (TPSSC) and of the Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Committee (THLPSSC). The PHMSA staff will brief the committee members on pipeline regulatory actions and policy concerns. The purpose of the meeting is to keep the members updated on current safety concerns, proposed rules, and future proposals.

**DATES:** The meeting will be on Thursday, August 19, 2010, from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. EST.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cheryl Whetsel by phone at 202-366-4431 or by e-mail at [cheryl.whetsel@dot.gov](mailto:cheryl.whetsel@dot.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Meeting Details

The TPSSC and the THLPSSC will take part in the meeting by telephone conference call. The public may attend the meeting at the U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, Room E27-302. Attendees should register in advance at <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/meetings/MtgHome.mtg?mtg=66>. PHMSA will post any new information or changes on the PHMSA/Office of Pipeline Safety

web page (<http://PHMSA.dot.gov>) about 15 days before the meeting takes place.

Comments on the meeting may be submitted to the docket in the following ways:

*E-Gov Web Site:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. This site allows the public to enter comments on any **Federal Register** notice issued by any agency.

*Fax:* 1-202-493-2251.

*Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590-001.

*Hand Delivery:* Room W12-140 on the ground level of the DOT West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

*Instructions:* Identify the docket number, PHMSA-2009-0203 at the beginning of your comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. You should know that anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Therefore, you may want to review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477) or view the Privacy Notice at <http://www.regulations.gov> before submitting any such comments.

*Docket:* For access to the docket or to read background documents or comments, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time or to Room W12-140 on the ground level of the DOT West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

If you wish to receive confirmation of receipt of your written comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the following

statement: "Comments on PHMSA-2009-0203." The Docket Clerk date stamps the postcard prior to returning it to you via the U.S. mail. Please note that due to delays in the delivery of U.S. mail to Federal offices in Washington, DC, we recommend that persons consider an alternative method (internet, fax, or professional delivery service) of submitting comments to the docket and ensuring their timely receipt at DOT.

##### Privacy Act Statement

Anyone may search the electronic form of comments received in response to any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement was published in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477).

##### Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities, or to seek special assistance at the meetings, please contact Cheryl Whetsel at 202-366-4431 by August 16, 2010.

## II. Committee Background

These two statutorily-mandated committees advise PHMSA on proposed safety standards, risk assessments, and safety policies for natural gas pipelines and for hazardous liquid pipelines. Both committees fall under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C. App. 1) and both are mandated by the pipeline safety law (49 U.S.C. Chap. 601). Each committee consists of 15 members—with membership evenly divided among the Federal and State Government, the regulated industry, and the public. The committees advise PHMSA on technical feasibility, practicability, and cost-effectiveness of each proposed pipeline safety standard.