

information on the operation of their EAS equipment during a national test of the EAS: (1) Whether they received the alert message during the designated test; (2) whether they retransmitted the alert; and (3) if they were not able to receive and/or transmit the alert, their 'best effort' diagnostic analysis regarding the cause or causes for such failure. OMB also authorized the Commission to require EAS Participants to provide it with the date/time of receipt of the EAN message by all stations; and the date/time of receipt of the EAT message by all stations; a description of their station identification and level of designation (PEP, LP-1, etc.); who they were monitoring at the time of the test, and the make and model number of the EAS equipment that they utilized.

In the Third Report and Order in EB Docket No. 04-296, FCC 09-10, the Commission adopted the foregoing rule requirements. In addition, the Commission decided that test data will be presumed confidential and disclosure of test data will be limited to FEMA, NWS and EOP at the federal level. At the State level, test data will be made available only to State government emergency management agencies that have confidential treatment protections at least equal to FOIA. The process by which these agencies would receive test data will comport with those used to provide access to the Commission's NORS and DIRS data. We seek comment on this revision of the approved collection.

In the Third Report and Order, the Commission also indicated that it would establish a voluntary electronic reporting system that EAS test participants may use as part of their participation in the national EAS test. The Commission noted that using this system, EAS test participants could input the same information that they were already required to file manually via a web-based interface into a confidential database that the Commission would use to monitor and assess the test. This information would include identifying information such as station call letters, license identification number, geographic coordinates, EAS assignment (LP, NP, etc), EAS monitoring assignment, as well as a 24/7 emergency contact for the EAS Participant. The only difference, other than the electronic nature of the filing, would be the timing of the collection. On the day of the test, EAS Test participants would be able to input immediate test results, (e.g., was the EAN received and did it pass) into a web-based interface. Test participants would submit the identifying data prior to the test date, and the remaining data

called for by our reporting rules (e.g. the detailed test results) within the 45 day period. The Commission believes that structuring an electronic reporting system in this fashion would allow the participants to populate the database with known information well prior to the test, and thus be able to provide the Commission with actual test data, both close to real-time and within a reasonable period in a minimally burdensome fashion. The Commission also seeks comment on this revision of the approved collection.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 2011-21545 Filed 8-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Determination of Insufficient Assets To Satisfy Claims Against Financial Institution in Receivership

AGENCY: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The FDIC has determined that insufficient assets exist in the receivership of Sun American Bank, Boca Raton, Florida, to make any distribution on general unsecured claims, and therefore such claims will recover nothing and have no value.

DATES: The FDIC made its determination on August 18, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions regarding this notice, you may contact an FDIC Claims Agent at (904) 256-3925. Written correspondence may also be mailed to FDIC as Receiver of Sun American Bank, Attention: Claims Agent, 7777 Baymeadows Way West, Jacksonville, Florida 32256.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 5, 2010, Sun American Bank, Boca Raton, Florida, (FIN #10192) was closed by the Florida Office of Financial Regulation, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") was appointed as its receiver ("Receiver"). In complying with its statutory duty to resolve the institution in the method that is least costly to the deposit insurance fund, *see* 12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4), the FDIC facilitated a transaction with First-Citizens Bank & Trust Company, Raleigh, North Carolina, to acquire all of the deposits and most of the assets of the failed institution.

Section 11(d)(11)(A) of the FDI Act, 12 U.S.C. 1821(d)(11)(A), sets forth the order of priority for distribution of amounts realized from the liquidation or other resolution of an insured depository institution to pay claims. Under the statutory order of priority, administrative expenses and deposit liabilities must be paid in full before any distribution may be made to general unsecured creditors or any lower priority claims.

As of June 30, 2011, the value of assets available for distribution by the Receiver, together with maximum possible recoveries on claims against directors, officers, and other professionals was \$86,789,915. As of the same date, administrative expenses and depositor liabilities equaled \$220,441,349, exceeding available assets and potential recoveries by \$133,651,434. Accordingly, the FDIC has determined that insufficient assets exist to make any distribution on general unsecured creditor claims (and any lower priority claims) and therefore all such claims, asserted or unasserted, will recover nothing and have no value.

Dated: August 18, 2011.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-21546 Filed 8-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Notice of Intent To Award Affordable Care Act Funding, DP-09-001

AGENCY: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice provides public announcement of CDC's intent to fund Approved cooperative agreement applications previously received and competed in response to CDC Funding Opportunity, RFA-DP-09-001, "Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research Centers (U48)." It is the intent of CDC to fund the applications with Patient Protection Affordable Care Act (ACA), Section 4002, appropriations.

CFDA Number 93.542 is the ACA-specific CFDA number for this initiative.

Award Information

Approximate Current Fiscal Year Funding: \$10,000,000.

Approximate Number of Awards: 15–17.

Approximate Average Award: \$625,000.

Fiscal Year Funds: 2011.

Anticipated Award Date: September 30, 2011.

Budget Period: 12 months.

Project Period: 1 year.

Application Selection Process

Only applicants who have applied for and have been selected as Prevention Research Centers under CDC Program Announcement DP–09–001 were eligible to apply for the annual continuation funding.

Funding Authority

CDC will add the following Authority to that which is reflected in the published Funding Opportunity:—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. L. 111–148.).

DATES: The effective date for this action is August 23, 2011 and remains in effect until the expiration of the project period of the ACA funded applications.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elmira Benson, Deputy Director, Procurement and Grants Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341, telephone (770) 488–2802, e-mail Elmira.Benson@cdc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 23, 2010, the President signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). ACA is designed to improve and expand the scope of health care coverage for Americans. Cost savings through disease prevention is an important element of this legislation and ACA has established a Prevention and Public Health Fund (PPHF) for this purpose. Specifically, the legislation states in Section 4002 that the PPHF is to “provide for expanded and sustained national investment in prevention and public health programs to improve health and help restrain the rate of growth in private and public sector health care costs. ACA and the Prevention and Public Health Fund make improving public health a priority with investments to improve public health.

The PPHF states that the Secretary shall transfer amounts in the Fund to accounts within the Department of Health and Human Services to increase funding, over the fiscal year 2008 level, for programs authorized by the Public Health Services Act, for prevention, wellness and public health activities including prevention research and health screenings, such as the

Community Transformation Grant Program, the Education and Outreach Campaign for Preventative Benefits, and Immunization Programs.

ACA legislation affords an important opportunity to advance public health across the lifespan and to reduce health disparities by supporting an intensive community approach to chronic disease prevention and control.

Therefore, the FOA program activities CDC proposes to fund with ACA appropriations are authorized by the amendment to the Public Health Services Act which authorized the Prevention and Wellness Program.

Dated: August 9, 2011.

Tanja Popovic,

Deputy Associate Director for Science, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2011–21343 Filed 8–22–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[Docket Number NIOSH–240]

Request for Information: Announcement of Carcinogen and Recommended Exposure Limit (REL) Policy Assessment

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

ACTION: Notice of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) intends to review its approach to classifying carcinogens and establishing recommended exposure limits (RELs) for occupational exposures to hazards associated with cancer. As part of this effort, NIOSH is requesting initial input on these issues (including answers to the 5 questions in the following section), to be submitted to the NIOSH Docket number 240, for a comment period lasting through September 22, 2011. This information will be taken under consideration and used to inform NIOSH efforts to assess and document its carcinogen policy and REL policy regarding occupational hazards associated with cancer. NIOSH has also created a new NIOSH Cancer and REL Policy Web Topic Page [see <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/cancer/>

[policy.html](#)] to provide additional details about this effort and progress updates.

Public Comment Period: Comments must be received by September 22, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Written comments, identified by docket number NIOSH–240, may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- *Mail:* NIOSH Docket Office, Robert A. Taft Laboratories, MS–C34, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45226.
- *Facsimile:* (513) 533–8285.
- *E-mail:* nioshdocket@cdc.gov.

All information received in response to this notice will be available for public examination and copying at the NIOSH Docket Office, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Room 111, Cincinnati, Ohio 45226. A complete electronic docket containing all comments submitted will be available on the NIOSH Web page at <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docket>, and comments will be available in writing by request. NIOSH includes all comments received without change in the docket, including any personal information provided. All electronic comments should be formatted as Microsoft Word. Please make reference to docket number NIOSH–240.

Background

NIOSH is announcing a Request for Information on key issues identified and associated with the NIOSH Carcinogen and REL policies. Special emphasis will be placed on consideration of technical and scientific issues with the current NIOSH Cancer and REL Policies that require further examination including the following:

(1) Should there explicitly be a carcinogen policy as opposed to a broader policy on toxicant identification and classification (e.g. carcinogens, reproductive hazards, neurotoxic agents)?

(2) What evidence should form the basis for determining that substances are carcinogens? How should these criteria correspond to nomenclature and categorizations (e.g., known, reasonably anticipated, etc.)?

(3) Should 1 in 1,000 working lifetime risk (for persons occupationally exposed) be the target level for a recommended exposure limit (REL) for carcinogens or should lower targets be considered?

(4) In establishing NIOSH RELs, how should the phrase “to the extent feasible” (defined in the 1995 NIOSH Recommended Exposure Limit Policy) be interpreted and applied?

(5) In the absence of data, what uncertainties or assumptions are