

of mathematical model) and variability (inherent differences due to heterogeneity or diversity in the population or exposure variable). The discussion may be qualitative or include quantitative estimates of uncertainty and variability. While variability and uncertainty are distinct issues and should be considered separately in each analysis, in practice, the available data may not be sufficient to distinguish between them.

Risk assessments may be based on deterministic or probabilistic modeling. Probabilistic modeling uses probability distributions for some or all inputs in conjunction with statistical techniques such as Monte Carlo analysis, and results in a distribution of exposure or risk estimates, providing quantification of uncertainty and variability. Deterministic modeling enters point estimates for the model's inputs and results in a point estimate of the exposure or risk. Separate uncertainty analysis may be used with a deterministic approach to characterize the range of the most likely exposure and risk.

Because exposure and risk assessments are conducted for different reasons, the ultimate use of the assessment results will help determine the methodological approaches and techniques to be used. The choice of approach may be based on considerations of the available scientific information, institutional policies, available time and resources, and limitations of the methods. For example, deterministic techniques may be appropriate for initial analyses that are often under time and resource constraints; however, the use of multiple protective values in a deterministic analysis may lead to unintentionally protective results, *i.e.*, compounding safety factors. A probabilistic assessment may be used to generate information on the distribution of exposure and risk in a population or to explore the uncertainty in the true, but unknown risk to an individual, but the risk assessor must consider that sparse data or poorly fitting distributions to the data for one or more model inputs could lead to inappropriate conclusions about the results, particularly at the tails of the distribution, which may be most sensitive to deficiencies in the data. A probabilistic model may be sensitive to correlations between input variables; the presence of correlations and dependence among variables and their effects on the output should be considered.

A carcinogenic risk of one per million or less is the guidelines' default level for

defining acceptable risk (16 CFR 1500.135(d)(4)(i)). In a deterministic analysis, one per million is compared directly with the risk value that results from the analysis. Interpretation of probabilistic results should be based in part on the relationship of the central tendency estimate (*e.g.*, mean or median, as appropriate for the specific distribution) to the one per million acceptable risk level, but all characteristics of the resulting distribution should be considered.

For assessment of non-carcinogens in a deterministic assessment, the exposure estimate is compared directly with the ADI, or the hazard index (HI) is calculated as the ratio of the estimated exposure to the ADI (HI greater than one means that the exposure may be hazardous; HI less than one represents negligible risk). Probabilistic results should be interpreted in part by comparing the central tendency estimate to the acceptable daily intake, but all characteristics of the resulting distribution should be considered.

The guidance for interpretation of both cancer and non-cancer exposure and risk are intended to facilitate the assessment process, but in practice, risk assessors and risk managers will consider the specific information in each case in defining acceptable exposure and risk.

D. References

- Babich MA. 2002. Updated risk assessment of oral exposure to diisononyl phthalate (DINP) in children's products. In: Response to Petition HP 99-1. Request to Ban PVC in Toys and Other Products intended for Children Five Years of Age and Under. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. Washington, DC 20207. August 2002. <http://www.cpsc.gov/library/foia/foia02/brief/briefing.html> (TAB L).
- Babich MA, Greene MA, Chen S, Porter WK, Kiss CT, Smith TP, Wind ML. 2004. Risk assessment of oral exposure to diisononyl phthalate from children's products. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 40: 151-167.
- Babich MA, Bevington C, Dreyfus M (2020) Plasticizer migration from children's toys, child care articles, art materials, and school supplies. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 111: 104574.
- Burmester DE. 1996. Benefits and Costs of Using Probabilistic Techniques in Human Health Risk Assessments—with an Emphasis on Site-Specific Risk Assessments. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment* 2(1): 35-43.
- Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). 1992. Labeling requirements for art materials presenting chronic hazards; guidelines for determining chronic toxicity of products subject to the FHSA; supplementary definition of "toxic" under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act; final rules. 57 FR: 46626-46674 (9 October 1992). https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_pdf_chronic_hazard_guidelines.pdf.
- Cullen AC and Frey HC. 1999. *Probabilistic Techniques in Exposure Assessment: A Handbook for Dealing with Variability and Uncertainty in Models and Inputs*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Greene M. 2002. Oral DINP Intake Among Young Children. In: Response to Petition HP 99-1. Request to Ban PVC in Toys and Other Products intended for Children Five Years of Age and Under. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. Washington, DC 20207. August 2002. <http://www.cpsc.gov/library/foia/foia02/brief/briefing.html> (TAB K).
- Hatlelid KM. 2003. Cancer risk assessment for arsenic exposure from CCA-treated wood playground structures. In: Re: Petition HP 01-3. Request to Ban Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA)-Treated Wood in Playground Equipment. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. Washington, DC 20207. February 2003.
- Kendall RJ, Anderson TA, Baker RJ, Bens CM, Carr JA, Chiodo LA, Cobb III GP, Dickerson, RL, Dixon, KR, Frame LT, Hooper MJ, Martin CF, McMurry ST, Patino R, Smith EE, Theodorakis CW. 2001. *Ecotoxicology*. In, *Casarett & Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of Poisons*. CD Klaassen, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Morgan MG and Henrion M. 1990. *Uncertainty: A Guide to Dealing with Uncertainty in Quantitative Risk and Policy Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- National Research Council (NRC). 1983. *Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Alberta E. Mills,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2024-08604 Filed 4-22-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Business Board; Notice of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice of Federal advisory committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The DoD is publishing this notice to announce that the following Federal advisory committee meeting of the Defense Business Board ("the Board") will take place.

DATES: Closed to the public May 7, 2024 from 9:00 a.m. to 7:05 p.m. and closed to the public May 8, 2024 from 8:30 a.m. to 11:50 a.m. All Eastern time.

ADDRESSES: The closed meeting will be held in room B7 of the Pentagon Library Conference Center, Room 4D728 in the Pentagon, and the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Cara Allison Marshall, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) of the Board in writing at Defense Business Board, 1155 Defense Pentagon, Room 5B1088A, Washington, DC 20301-1155; or by email at cara.l.allisonmarshall.civ@mail.mil; or by phone at 703-614-1834.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting is being held under the provisions of chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.) (commonly known as the “Federal Advisory Committee Act” or “FACA”), section 552b of title 5, U.S.C. (commonly known as the “Government in the Sunshine Act”), and 41 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 102-3.140 and 102-3.150.

Purpose of Meeting: The mission of the Board is to examine and advise the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense on overall DoD management and governance. The Board provides independent, strategic-level, private sector and academic advice and counsel on enterprise-wide business management approaches and best practices for business operations and achieving National Defense goals.

Agenda: The Board will begin in closed session on May 7 from 9:00 a.m. to 7:05 p.m. The DFO will begin the closed session followed by a welcome by Board Chair, Hon. Deborah James. The Board will receive a classified discussion on Implementing Emerging Technologies to Create Operational Strategic Effects from Mr. Jay Dryer, Director, Strategic Capabilities Office. This discussion will focus on using existing DoD tools and processes to adapt developing technology to key operational challenges in the National Defense Strategy (NDS). Next, the Board will receive a classified discussion on Current Affairs from Hon. Lloyd Austin, Secretary of Defense. This session is expected to focus on the state of the current global security environment and its implications for current and future business operations. The Board will receive a classified briefing on Naval Research Lab (NRL) Operations at the U.S. NRL, followed by a classified tour. This tour and discussion will explore management constructs unique to NRL’s mission and personnel, to include developing and managing talent and

communicating across a diverse workforce. This portion of the meeting will cover how NRL partners with industry to fulfill their mandate and demonstrates capabilities made possible by NRL’s organizational constructs and authorities. The Board Chair, Hon. Deborah James and Deputy Secretary, Hon. Kathleen Hicks will provide remarks, followed by a classified update on Industry Partnerships with the Director of Information Systems Agency (DISA), Lt Gen Robert J. Skinner, Director of DISA and the Commander of the Joint Force Headquarters-DoD Information Network. The Director will offer an overview of DISA’s partnerships with various stakeholders to bolster warfighter capabilities, including how DISA is developing global situational awareness and assessing the threat against DISA operations and assets. He will discuss unique challenges of managing a DoD Agency and Field Activity, as well as provide insights on recommendations from the February 2023 DBB IT User Experience Study. The DFO will adjourn the closed session. The Board will reconvene in closed session May 8 from 8:30 a.m. to 11:50 a.m. in room B7 of the Pentagon Library Conference Center. The DFO will begin the closed session followed by a welcome by the Board Chair. The Board will receive a classified discussion on Growing Production Capacity for Crises from Dr. Erin Simpson, Director, Joint Production Accelerator Cell, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition & Sustainment. The conversation is expected to delve into actions the DoD is taking to prioritize resources and to create a modern, resilient defense industrial ecosystem designed to deter United States adversaries and meet the production demands posed by evolving threats.

Dr. Simpson will elaborate on the obstacles confronting the DoD in building resilient supply chains. Next, the Board will receive a classified discussion on Emerging Global Threats, including the Supply Chain, and their Potential Implications for the NDS from MG Joseph “JP” McGee, U.S. Army, Director for Strategy, Plans & Policy, J5. This discussion will focus on strategic proactiveness to ensure adaptability, resilience, and continued effectiveness in an ever-evolving security landscape and on how the DoD can partner with industry before and during crises. After a short break, the Board will receive their final classified discussion on Making DoD Work Attractive to Non-Traditional Companies from Hon. Kathleen Hicks. The Deputy Secretary

will share successes the DoD has realized in becoming a better partner for non-traditional defense companies, along with how combinations of traditional and non-traditional companies are working together to accelerate capability development and delivery. The DFO will adjourn the closed session. The latest version of the agenda will be available on the Board’s website at: <https://dbb.dod.afpims.mil/Meetings/Meeting-May-7-8-2024/>.

Meeting Accessibility: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 1009(d) and 41 CFR 102-3.155, it is hereby determined that the May 7-8 meeting of the Board will include classified information and other matters covered by 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and that, accordingly, the meeting will be closed to the public. This determination is based on the consideration that it is expected that discussions throughout the meeting will involve classified matters of national security. Such classified material is so intertwined with the unclassified material that it cannot reasonably be segregated into separate discussions without defeating the effectiveness and meaning of the meeting. To permit the meeting to be open to the public would preclude discussion of such matters and would greatly diminish the ultimate utility of the Board’s findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Written Comments and Statements: Pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.105(j) and 102-3.140 and 5 U.S.C. 1009(a)(3), the public or interested organizations may submit written comments or statements to the Board in response to the stated agenda of the meeting or regarding the Board’s mission in general. Written comments or statements should be submitted to

Ms. Cara Allison Marshall, the DFO, via electronic mail (the preferred mode of submission) at the address listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Each page of the comment or statement must include the author’s name, title or affiliation, address, and daytime phone number. The DFO must receive written comments or statements submitted in response to the agenda set forth in this notice by close of business Friday, May 3, 2024, to be considered by the Board. The DFO will review all timely submitted written comments or statements with the Board Chair and ensure the comments are provided to all members of the Board before the meeting. Written comments or statements received after this date may not be provided to the Board until its next scheduled meeting. Please note that all submitted comments and

statements will be treated as public documents and will be made available for public inspection, including, but not limited to, being posted on the Board's website.

Dated: April 17, 2024.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2024-08589 Filed 4-22-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001-FR-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Applications for New Awards; Comprehensive Literacy State Development

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) is issuing a notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2024 for the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) program, Assistance Listing Number 84.371C. This notice relates to the approved information collection under OMB control number 1894-0006.

DATES:

Applications Available: April 23, 2024.

Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply: May 13, 2024.

Deadline for Transmittal of

Applications: June 24, 2024.

Deadline for Intergovernmental

Review: August 21, 2024.

Pre-Application Webinar Information:

The Department will hold a pre-application meeting via webinar for prospective applicants. For information about the pre-application webinar, visit the CLSD website at: <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/well-rounded-education-programs/striving-readers-comprehensive-literacy-srcl-formula-grants-84-371a-for-state-literacy-teams/>.

ADDRESSES: For the addresses for obtaining and submitting an application, please refer to our Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the **Federal Register** on December 7, 2022 (87 FR 75045), and available at <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/12/07/2022-26554/common-instructions-for-applicants-to-department-of-education-discretionary-grant-programs>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Berry, U.S. Department of

Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 4C128, Washington, DC 20202-6450. Telephone: (202) 453-7088. Email: michael.berry@ed.gov.

If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability and wish to access telecommunications relay services, please dial 7-1-1.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The CLSD program awards competitive grants to advance literacy skills through the use of evidence-based (as defined in this notice) practices, activities, and interventions, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for children from birth through grade 12, with an emphasis on disadvantaged children, including children living in poverty, English learners (as defined in this notice), and children with disabilities (as defined in this notice).

Background: The Department's "Raise the Bar: Lead the World" initiative is a call to action to transform preschool through grade 12 education and beyond, and to unite education leaders at all levels around evidence-based strategies that advance educational equity and excellence for all students.¹ Raising the bar in education focuses on building the skills that all students need to thrive inside and outside of school, and supporting students to excel in the classroom, in their careers, and in their communities.

Specifically, the Department is focused on improving student achievement, including in math and reading, as highlighted across Administration and Department efforts for the past several years. Building on the Administration's previous efforts, in January 2024, the Administration announced its Improving Student Achievement Agenda,² which aims to drive proven strategies that will support academic success for every child in school. The strategies and evidence discussed in the Improving Student Achievement Agenda focus on (1) increasing student attendance; (2) providing high-dosage tutoring; and (3) increasing summer learning and extended or afterschool learning time. These strategies and the broader Improving Student Achievement Agenda, including a focus on core academic instruction, are well aligned with the CLSD program purpose of

¹ <https://www.ed.gov/raisethebar/>.

² <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2024/01/17/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-improving-student-achievement-agenda-in-2024/>.

improving literacy outcomes, and the new funding to be released through the FY 2024 CLSD competition will help accelerate and scale up sustainable adoption of evidence-based strategies that we expect will improve student literacy outcomes in the school years ahead.

Through the FY 2024 CLSD competition, the Department encourages State educational agencies (SEAs) to focus on evidence-based activities that provide explicit intervention and support in reading and writing for children from birth to grade 12, including activities that have been implemented in response to identified literacy gaps and that have positive outcome data. SEAs should take into consideration the resources of the What Works Clearinghouse,³ including the literacy-focused Practice Guides and Intervention Reports on the most effective strategies for supporting student literacy and that are appropriate for the grade, age, and developmental level of the student. Highly effective, evidence-based literacy strategies covered in the Practice Guides, for example, include developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; building students' comprehension and decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; and providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly. The What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Reports provide a summary of the highest quality research to help SEA and school district personnel identify the literacy interventions with the strongest evidence bases. The Department encourages SEAs to consult these Intervention Reports to inform their proposals and the technical assistance they provide to school districts. Another resource the Department encourages SEAs to use is the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) National Literacy Center,⁴ which has a

³ The Department provides several resources related to evidence-based practices and interventions in literacy. For example, the Institute of Education Sciences' What Works Clearinghouse (<https://whatworks.ed.gov>) has ten practice guides that offer evidence-based recommendations on literacy and/or writing that are applicable to preschool, elementary, and secondary school settings. Additionally, WWC Intervention Reports review the strength of evidence for branded interventions supporting literacy (and other) outcomes. Other Department resources, including those related to the Best Practices Clearinghouse (<https://bestpracticesclearinghouse.gov>) and Raise the Bar (<https://ed.gov/raisethebar/academic-success>), may also be of interest to some applicants.

⁴ <https://literacycenter.ed.gov/>.