

Needs and Uses: The Commission will submit this expiring information collection (IC) to the OMB as an extension during this comment period to obtain the full three-year clearance from them. The Commission is reporting no change in burden estimates and no change in the reporting requirement.

The Commission responded to petitions for reconsideration of certain aspects of the *Third Report and Order*, FCC 99–245, in the proceeding concerning the establishment of a nationwide wireless enhanced 911 (E911) emergency communications service.

The *Fourth Report and Order*, FCC 00–236, revised and made adjustments to the deployment schedule that must be followed by wireless carriers that chose to implement E911 service using a handset-based technology. The Commission also deferred the date for initial distribution of Automatic Location Identification (ALI)-capable handsets by seven months; adjusting the timetable for carriers to meet certain interim benchmarks for activating new ALI-capable handsets; deferred the date by which a carrier must achieve full penetration of ALI-capable handsets by one year; modified the manner in which the Commission defined full penetration; eliminated the separate handset phase-in schedule triggered by a request from a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP), and addressed several other issues regarding implementation of enhanced 911 Phase II. The Commission also discussed its general approach toward possible request for waiver of the E911 Phase II requirements. As a general rule, the Commission's rules may be waived for good cause shown and that waivers are only appropriate if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and will serve the public interest. Wireless carriers are instructed to submit waiver requests that are specific, focused and limited in scope, and with a clear path to full compliance. A waiver request must specify the solutions considered and explain why none could be employed in a way that complies to the Phase II rules. If deployment must be delayed, the carrier should specify the reason for the delay and provide a revised schedule.

The Commission found that waivers of the E911 Phase II requirements should not generally be warranted, especially in light of the vital public safety benefits of Phase II. However, in those particular cases where waivers may be justified, broad generalized waivers should not be necessary and will not be granted. Further, carriers

should undertake concrete steps necessary to come as close as possible to full compliance and should document their efforts aimed at compliance in support of any waiver requests. Carriers seeking a waiver will be expected to specify the solutions they considered and explain why none could be employed in a way that complies with the Phase II rules. If deployment is scheduled but for some reason must be delayed, the carrier should specify the reason for the delay and provide a revised schedule.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–27582 Filed 11–1–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission, Comments Requested

October 22, 2010.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520. Comments are requested concerning: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, and (e) ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

DATES: Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be

submitted on or before January 3, 2011. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the FCC contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Nicholas A. Fraser, Office of Management and Budget, via fax at 202–395–5167 or via the Internet at *Nicholas.A.Fraser@omb.eop.gov* and to the Federal Communications Commission via e-mail to *PRA@fcc.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information, contact Judith B. Herman, OMD, 202–418–0214 or e-mail *Judith-b.herman@fcc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OMB Control Number: 3060–0809.

Title: Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA).

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 200 respondents; 285 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 12 hours average (range of 7.5 hours–80 hours).

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement and third party disclosure requirement.

Obligation To Respond: Mandatory. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in sections 105, 107(c), 109(b) and 301 of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA), 47 U.S.C. sections 1004, 1006(c), 1008(c), and 229.

Total Annual Burden: 3,475 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: Pursuant to section 0.457(g) of the Commission's rules, the information in the CALEA security system filings and petitions will not be made routinely available for public inspection.

Section 107(c) and section 109(c) filings are entitled to confidential treatment under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The Commission has directed respondents to file their petitions under a general claim of confidentiality or proprietary protection, subject only to scrutiny by the Commission and the Attorney General who is consulted in section 107(c) adjudications and is a party to all section 109(c) adjudications.

Needs and Uses: The Commission will submit this revised collection to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) after this comment period to

obtain the full three-year approval from them. The Commission is revising this information collection to eliminate the recordkeeping burden estimated associated in 47 CFR 1.20004. This estimate has been eliminated by 1,655 hours because the nature and extent of the requirement is usual and customary. Telecommunications carriers must keep such records to demonstrate that they are in compliance with Federal and State wiretapping laws and regulations that have existed for the past 40 years.

The Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) requires the Commission to create rules that regulate the conduct and recordkeeping of lawful electronic surveillance. CALEA was enacted in October 1994 to respond to rapid advances in telecommunications technology and eliminates obstacles faced by law enforcement personnel in conducting electronic surveillance. Section 105 of CALEA requires telecommunications carriers to protect against the unlawful interception of communications passing through their systems. Law enforcement officials use the information maintained by telecommunications carriers to determine the accountability and accuracy of telecommunications carriers' compliance with lawful electronic surveillance orders.

On May 12, 2006, the Commission adopted and released a *Second Report and Order* and *Memorandum Opinion and Order* in ET Docket No. 04-195, FCC 06-56, which became effective August 4, 2006, except for sections 1.20004 and 1.20005 of the Commission's rules, which became effective on February 12, 2007. The *Second Report and Order* established new guidelines for filing section 107(c) petitions, section 109(b) petitions, and monitoring reports (formerly FCC Form 445). CALEA section 107(c)(1) permits a petitioner to apply for an extension of time, up to two years from the date that the petition is filed, and to come into compliance with a particular CALEA section 103 capability requirement. CALEA section 109(b) permits a telecommunications carrier covered by CALEA to file a petition with the FCC and an application with the Department of Justice (DoJ) to request that DoJ pay the costs of the carrier's CALEA compliance (cost-shifting relief) with respect to any equipment, facility or service installed or deployed after January 1, 1995. The *Second Report and Order* required several different collections of information:

(1) Within 90 days of the effective date of the *Second Report and Order*, facilities based broadband Internet access and interconnected Voice over

Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers newly identified in the *First Report and Order* in this proceeding were required to file system security statements under the Commission's rules. (Security systems are currently approved under this information collection.)

(2) All telecommunications carriers, including broadband Internet access and interconnected VoIP providers, must file updates to their systems security statements on file with the Commission as their information changes.

(3) Petitions filed under Section 107(c), requires for additional time to comply with CALEA; these provisions apply to all carriers subject to CALEA and are voluntary filings.

(4) Section 109(b), request for reimbursement of CALEA; these provisions apply to all carriers subject to CALEA and are voluntary filings.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010-27581 Filed 11-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Decision To Evaluate a Petition To Designate a Class of Employees From Clinton Engineering Works in Oak Ridge, TN, To Be Included in the Special Exposure Cohort

AGENCY: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: HHS gives notice as required by 42 CFR 83.12(e) of a decision to evaluate a petition to designate a class of employees from Clinton Engineering Works in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to be included in the Special Exposure Cohort under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. The initial proposed definition for the class being evaluated, subject to revision as warranted by the evaluation, is as follows:

Facility: Clinton Engineering Works.
Location: Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
Job Titles and/or Job Duties: All guards and service workers who worked in or around the warehouses at the Elza Gate area.

Period of Employment: January 1, 1943 through May 18, 1947.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stuart L. Hinnefeld, Interim Director, Division of Compensation Analysis and

Support, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 4676 Columbia Parkway, MS C-46, Cincinnati, OH 45226, Telephone 877-222-7570. Information requests can also be submitted by e-mail to DCAS@CDC.GOV.

John Howard,

Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2010-27597 Filed 11-1-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163-19-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Final Effect of Designation of a Class of Employees for Addition to the Special Exposure Cohort

AGENCY: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: HHS gives notice concerning the final effect of the HHS decision to designate a class of employees from the Blockson Chemical Company, Joliet, Illinois, as an addition to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. On September 3, 2010, as provided for under 42 U.S.C. 7384q(b), the Secretary of HHS designated the following class of employees as an addition to the SEC:

All Atomic Weapons Employer employees who worked at the Blockson Chemical Company in Joliet, Illinois from March 1, 1951 to June 30, 1960, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment, or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees included in the Special Exposure Cohort.

This designation became effective on October 3, 2010, as provided for under 42 U.S.C. 7384l(14)(C). Hence, beginning on October 3, 2010, members of this class of employees, defined as reported in this notice, became members of the Special Exposure Cohort.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stuart L. Hinnefeld, Interim Director, Division of Compensation Analysis and Support, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 4676 Columbia Parkway, MS C-46, Cincinnati, OH 45226, Telephone 877-222-7570. Information requests can