

privileges to furnish telemedicine services under an agreement with the hospital, the criteria for determining privileges and the procedure for applying the criteria are also subject to the requirements in § 482.12(a)(8) and § 482.22(a)(3).

* * * * *

PART 485—CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION: SPECIALIZED PROVIDERS

4. The authority citation for part 485 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 1102 and 1871 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1302 and 1395(hh)).

Subpart F—Conditions of Participation: Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs)

5. Section 485.616 is amended by adding a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 485.616 Condition of participation: Agreements.

* * * * *

(c) *Standard: Agreements for credentialing and privileging of telemedicine physicians and practitioners.* (1) The governing body of the CAH must ensure that, when telemedicine services are furnished to the CAH's patients through an agreement with a distant-site (as defined at section 1834(m)(4)(A) of the Act) hospital, the agreement specifies that it is the responsibility of the governing body of the distant-site hospital to meet the following requirements with regard to its physicians or practitioners providing telemedicine services:

- (i) Determine, in accordance with State law, which categories of practitioners are eligible candidates for appointment to the medical staff.
- (ii) Appoint members of the medical staff after considering the recommendations of the existing members of the medical staff.
- (iii) Assure that the medical staff has bylaws.
- (iv) Approve medical staff bylaws and other medical staff rules and regulations.
- (v) Ensure that the medical staff is accountable to the governing body for the quality of care provided to patients.
- (vi) Ensure the criteria for selection are individual character, competence, training, experience, and judgment.
- (vii) Ensure that under no circumstances is the accordance of staff membership or professional privileges in the hospital dependent solely upon certification, fellowship or membership in a specialty body or society.

(2) When telemedicine services are furnished to the CAH's patients through an agreement with a distant-site (as defined at section 1834(m)(4)(A) of the Act) hospital, the CAH's governing body or responsible individual may choose to rely upon the credentialing and privileging decisions made by the governing body of the distant-site hospital regarding individual distant-site physicians or practitioners. The CAH's governing body or responsible individual must ensure that the following provisions are met:

- (i) The distant-site hospital providing telemedicine services is a Medicare-participating hospital.
- (ii) The individual distant-site physician or practitioner is privileged at the distant-site hospital providing the telemedicine services, which provides a current list of the distant-site physician's or practitioner's privileges;
- (iii) The individual distant-site physician or practitioner holds a license issued or recognized by the State in which the CAH is located; and
- (iv) With respect to a distant-site physician or practitioner granted privileges by the CAH, the CAH has evidence of an internal review of the distant-site physician's or practitioner's performance of these privileges and sends the distant-site hospital such information for use in the periodic appraisal of the individual distant-site physician or practitioner. At a minimum, this information must include all adverse events that result from the telemedicine services provided by the distant-site physician or practitioner to the CAH's patients and all complaints the CAH has received about the distant-site physician or practitioner.

6. Section 485.641 is amended by—
A. Republishing paragraph (b)(4)(i).
B. Revising paragraphs (b)(4)(ii) and (iii).
C. Adding a new paragraph (b)(4)(iv).
The additions and revisions read as follows:

§ 485.641 Condition of participation: Periodic evaluation and quality assurance review

* * * * *

- (b) * * *
- (4) The quality and appropriateness of the diagnosis and treatment furnished by doctors of medicine or osteopathy at the CAH are evaluated by—
 - (i) One hospital that is a member of the network, when applicable;
 - (ii) One QIO or equivalent entity;
 - (iii) One other appropriate and qualified entity identified in the State rural health care plan; or
 - (iv) In the case of distant-site physicians and practitioners providing

telemedicine services to the CAH's patients under an agreement between the CAH and a distant-site (as defined at section 1834(m)(4)(A) of the Act) hospital, the distant-site hospital.

* * * * *

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.773, Medicare—Hospital Insurance; and Program No. 93.774, Medicare—Supplementary Medical Insurance Program). (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.778, Medical Assistance Program)

Dated: May 20, 2010.

Marilyn Tavener,

Acting Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Approved: May 21, 2010.

Kathleen Sebelius,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–12647 Filed 5–21–10; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 578

[Docket No. NHTSA–2010–0066]

Reports, Forms and Record Keeping Requirements, Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.
ACTION: Notice of proposed extension, without change, of a currently approved collection of information.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, the agency must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections. In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 26, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments to the docket number identified in the heading of this document by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the

online instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, M-30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Rm. W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.

Regardless of how you submit your comments, please be sure to mention the docket number of this document and cite OMB Clearance No. 2127-0609, "Criminal Penalty Safe Harbor Provision."

You may call the Docket at 202-366-9322.

Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act discussion below.

Privacy Act: 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.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions please contact Mr. John Piazza in the Office of the Chief Counsel at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, telephone (202) 366-9511. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to OMB Clearance Number 2127-0609 "Criminal Penalty Safe Harbor Provision".

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulations (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

- 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;
- 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;

- how to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- how to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including 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.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks public comment on the following proposed extension, without change, of a currently approved collection of information:

Criminal Penalty Safe Harbor Provision

Type of Request—Extension, without change, of a currently approved collection.

OMB Clearance Number—2127-0609.

Form Number—This collection of information uses no standard forms.

Requested Expiration Date of Approval—Three (3) years from the date of approval of the collection.

Summary of the Collection of Information—Each person seeking safe harbor protection from criminal penalties under 49 U.S.C. 30170 related to an improper report or failure to report is required to submit the following information to NHTSA: (1) A signed and dated document that identifies (a) each previous improper report and each failure to report as required under 49 U.S.C. 30166, including a regulation, requirement, request or order issued thereunder, for which protection is sought and (b) the specific predicate under which the improper or omitted report should have been provided; and (2) the complete and correct information that was required to be submitted but was improperly submitted or was not previously submitted, including relevant documents that were not previously submitted to NHTSA or, if the person cannot do so, provide a detailed description of that information and/or the content of those documents and the reason why the individual cannot provide them to NHTSA. See 49 U.S.C. 30170(a)(2) and 49 CFR 578.7. See also, 66 FR 38380 (July 24, 2001) (safe harbor final rule) and 65 FR 81414 (Dec. 26, 2000) (safe harbor interim final rule).

Description of the Need for the Information and Use of the Information—This information collection was mandated by Section 5 of the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation Act,

codified at 49 U.S.C. 30170(a)(2). The information collected will provide NHTSA with information the agency should have received previously and will also promptly provide the agency with correct information to do its analyses, such as, for example, conducting tests or drawing conclusions about possible safety-related defects. NHTSA anticipates using this information to help it to accomplish its statutory assignment of identifying safety-related defects in motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment and, when appropriate, seeking safety recalls.

Description of the Likely Respondents, Including Estimated Number and Proposed Frequency of Response to the Collection of Information—This collection of information applies to any person who seeks a "safe harbor" from potential criminal liability for knowingly and willfully acting with the specific intention of misleading the Secretary by an act or omission that violates section 1001 of title 18 with respect to the reporting requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30166, regarding a safety-related defect in motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment that caused death or serious bodily injury to an individual. Thus, the collection of information applies to the manufacturers, and any officers or employees thereof, who respond or have a duty to respond to an information provision requirement pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30166 or a regulation, requirement, request or order issued thereunder.

We believe that there will be very few criminal prosecutions under section 30170, given its elements. Since the safe harbor related rule has been in place, the agency has not received any reports. Accordingly, it is not likely to be a substantial motivating force for a submission of a proper report. We estimate that no more than one such person a year would invoke this new collection of information, and we do not anticipate receiving more than one report a year from any particular person.

Estimate of the Total Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burdens Resulting From the Collection of Information—2 hours.

As stated before, we estimate that no more than one person a year would be subject to this collection of information. Incrementally, we estimate that on average it will take no longer than two hours for a person to compile and submit the information we are requiring to be reported. Therefore, the total burden hours on the public per year is estimated to be a maximum of two hours.

Since nothing in the rule requires those persons who submit reports pursuant to this rule to keep copies of any records or reports submitted to us, recordkeeping costs imposed would be zero hours and zero costs.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3506; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: May 21, 2010.

O. Kevin Vincent,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2010-12664 Filed 5-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 223

[Docket No. 090324348-9655-01]

RIN 0648-XO28

Listing Endangered and Threatened Species: Completion of a Review of the Status of the Oregon Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit of Coho Salmon; Proposal to Promulgate Rule Classifying Species as Threatened

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

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), propose to affirm the Endangered Species Act (ESA) status for the Oregon Coast (OC) Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) by promulgating a rule that will supersede our February 11, 2008, listing determination for this ESU. This proposal will also serve as our announcement of the outcome of a new review of the status of this ESU and request for public comment on the proposal to promulgate the OC coho salmon ESU listing determination. On February 11, 2008, we listed the OC coho salmon ESU as threatened, designated critical habitat, and issued final protective regulations under section the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (February 11, 2008). The ESA listing status of the OC coho salmon ESU has been controversial and has attracted litigation in the past. This listing determination is the result of a settlement agreement. This new listing determination will supersede our February 11, 2008, listing determination for this ESU. Our February 11, 2008, determination establishing protective

regulations under the ESA and designating critical habitat for this ESU will remain in effect.

DATES: Information and comments on this proposal must be received by July 26, 2010. A public hearing will be held promptly if any person so requests by July 12, 2010. Notice of the location and time of any such hearing will be published in the **Federal Register** not less than 15 days before the hearing is held.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by 0648-XO28 by any of the following methods:

- Electronic Submissions: Federal e-Rulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- Mail: Submit written comments to Chief, Protected Resources Division, Northwest Region, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100, Portland, OR 97232.

Instructions: All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted to <http://www.regulations.gov> without change. All Personal Identifying Information (for example, name, address, etc.) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information. We will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous). Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, WordPerfect, or Adobe PDF file formats only. Information about the OC coho salmon ESU can be obtained via the Internet at: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/> or by submitting a request to the Assistant Regional Administrator, Protected Resources Division, Northwest Region, NMFS, 1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100, Portland, OR 97232.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information regarding this proposal, contact Eric Murray, NMFS, Northwest Region, (503) 231-2378; or Marta Nammack, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, (301) 713-1401.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Previous Federal ESA Actions Related to Oregon Coast Coho Salmon

We first proposed to list the OC coho salmon ESU as threatened under the ESA in 1995 (60 FR 38011; July 25, 1995). Since then, we have completed several status reviews for this species, and its listing classification has changed between threatened and not warranted for listing a number of times. A complete history of this ESU's listing

status can be found in our February 11, 2008, final rule (73 FR 7816), classifying this ESU as a threatened species.

To summarize that history, on July 25, 1995 we first proposed to list the ESU as threatened (60 FR 38011). We withdrew that proposal in response to the State of Oregon's proposed conservation measures as described in the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (62 FR 24588; May 6, 1997). On June 1, 1998, the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon found that our determination to not list the OC coho salmon ESU was arbitrary and capricious (*Oregon Natural Resources Council v. Daley*, 6 F. Supp. 2d 1139 (D. Or. 1998)). The Court ruled that our decision gave too much weight to conservation measures with an uncertain likelihood of implementation. On August 10, 1998, we issued a final rule listing the OC coho ESU as threatened (63 FR 42587). In 2001, the U.S. District Court in Eugene, Oregon, set aside the 1998 threatened listing of the OC coho salmon ESU (*Alsea Valley Alliance v. Evans*, 161 F. Supp. 2d 1154, (D. Or. 2001)). The Court ruled that our failure to include certain hatchery fish as part of the ESU was not consistent with the ESA. Subsequently, we announced that we would conduct an updated status review of 27 West Coast salmonid ESUs, including the OC coho salmon ESU (67 FR 6215, February 11, 2002; 67 FR 48601, July 25, 2002).

To aid us in these reviews, we convened a team of Federal scientists, known as a biological review team (BRT). For the OC coho salmon ESU, NMFS concluded that this ESU was not in danger of extinction, but was likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future. The BRT noted considerable scientific uncertainty regarding the future viability of this ESU given unknowns about ocean conditions for coho salmon survival (Good *et al.*, 2005). They also stated that there is uncertainty about whether current freshwater habitats are of sufficient quality and quantity to support the then recent high abundance levels and sustain populations during future downturns in ocean conditions. Considering the BRT's scientific findings and our assessment of risks and benefits from artificial propagation programs included in the ESU, efforts being made to protect the species, and the five factors listed under section 4(a)(1) of the ESA, we proposed to list this ESU as threatened (69 FR 33102; June 14, 2004). In the June 2004 proposed rule, we noted that Oregon was initiating a comprehensive assessment of the viability of the OC coho salmon ESU and of the adequacy