

NMFS will provide the necessary administrative support, including technical assistance, for the HMS AP. However, NMFS will not compensate participants with monetary support of any kind. Depending on availability of funds, members may be reimbursed for travel costs related to the HMS AP meetings.

**C. Meeting Schedule**

Meetings of the HMS AP will be held as frequently as necessary but are routinely held twice each year—once in the spring, and once in the fall. The meetings may be held in conjunction with public hearings.

Dated: November 3, 2016.

**Alan D. Risenhoover,**

Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–26943 Filed 11–7–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. CPSC–2010–0041]

**Collection of Information; Proposed Extension of Approval; Comment Request—Publicly Available Consumer Product Safety Information Database**

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or Commission) requests comments on a proposed extension of approval of a collection of information for the Publicly Available Consumer Product Safety Information Database. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice before requesting an extension of approval of this collection of

information from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

**DATES:** Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by December 8, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** OMB recommends that written comments be faxed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, Attn: CPSC Desk Officer, FAX: 202–395–6974, or emailed to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov). All comments should be identified by Docket No. CPSC–2010–0041. In addition, written comments also should be submitted at <http://www.regulations.gov>, under Docket No. CPSC–2010–0041, or by mail/hand delivery/courier (for paper, disk, or CD-ROM submissions), preferably in five copies, to: Office of the Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923. For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information contact: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: [rsquibb@cpsc.gov](mailto:rsquibb@cpsc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the **Federal Register** of August 19, 2016 (81 FR 55449), the CPSC published a notice in accordance with provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). This notice announced CPSC’s intention to seek extension of approval of a collection of information for a database on the safety of consumer products and other products and substances regulated by the Commission (Database), as required by section 212 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA). We received one general comment in support of the Database in

response to the August 19 notice. The commenter noted that the existence of the Database may reduce FOIA requests. Nothing in the comment addressed CPSC’s burden analysis. Accordingly, by publication of this notice, the Commission announces that it has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for extension of approval of the collection of information for the Database without change.

**A. Background**

Section 212 of the CPSIA added section 6A to the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), which requires the Commission to establish and maintain a publicly available, searchable database on the safety of consumer products and other products or substances regulated by the Commission. Among other things, section 6A of the CPSA requires the Commission to collect reports of harm from the public for potential publication in the publicly available Database, and to collect and publish comments about reports of harm from manufacturers. As explained in the August 19, 2016 **Federal Register** notice (81 FR 55449), the Commission sought, and OMB approved, the collection of information for the Database under control number 3041–0146. OMB’s most recent extension of approval on December 2, 2013 will expire on December 31, 2016. Accordingly, the Commission now proposes to request an extension of approval of this collection of information. Details about the information collected through the Database are provided in the August 19, 2016 notice.

**B. Estimated Burden**

*1. Estimated Annual Burden for Respondents*

We estimate the burden of this collection of information as follows:

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN FOR REPORTS OF HARM

Collection type	Number of respondents	Response frequency <sup>1</sup>	Total annual responses	Minutes per response	Total burden, in hours <sup>2</sup>
Reports of Harm—submitted through Web site .....	6,582	1.03	6,790	12	1,358
Reports of Harm—submitted by phone .....	2,632	1.01	2,643	10	441
Reports of Harm—submitted by mail, email, fax .....	780	6.67	5,206	20	1,735
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>9,994</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>14,639</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>3,534</b>

<sup>1</sup> Frequency of responses is calculated by dividing the number of responses by the number of respondents.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers have been rounded.

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN FOR MANUFACTURER SUBMISSIONS

Collection type	Number of respondents	Response frequency <sup>1</sup>	Total annual responses	Minutes per response	Total burden, in hours <sup>2</sup>
Manufacturer Comments—submitted through Web site .....	532	6.23	3,317	117	6,468
Manufacturer Comments—submitted by mail, email, fax .....	283	1.22	346	147	848
Requests to Treat Information as Confidential—submitted through Web site .....	12	1.08	13	42	9
Requests to Treat Information as Confidential—submitted by mail, email, fax .....	0	n/a	0	72	0
Requests to Treat Information as Materially Inaccurate—submitted through Web site .....	131	1.82	238	165	655
Requests to Treat Information as Materially Inaccurate—submitted by mail, email, fax .....	79	1.06	84	195	273
Voluntary Brand Identification .....	829	1.48	1,228	10	205
Small Batch Manufacturer Identification .....	2,208	1	2,208	10	368
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>4,074</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>7,434</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>8,826</b>

Based on the data set forth in Tables 1 and 2 above, the annual reporting cost is estimated to be \$719,381. This estimate is based on the sum of two estimated total figures for reports of harm and manufacturer submissions. The estimated number of respondents and responses are based on the actual responses received in FY 2015. We assume that the number of responses and respondents will be similar in future years.

*Reports of Harm:* Table 1 sets forth the data used to estimate the burden associated with submitting reports of harm. We had previously estimated the time associated with the electronic and telephone submission of reports of harm at 12 and 10 minutes, respectively, and because we have had no indication that these estimates are not appropriate or accurate, we used those figures for present purposes as well. We estimate that the time associated with a paper or PDF form would be 20 minutes, on average.

To estimate the costs for submitting reports of harm, we multiplied the estimated total burden hours associated with reports of harm (1,358 hours + 441

hours + 1,735 hours = 3,534 hours) by an estimated total compensation for all workers in private industry of \$32.06 per hour,<sup>3</sup> which results in an estimated cost of \$113,300 (3,534 hours × \$32.06 per hour = \$113,300).

*Manufacturer Submissions:* Table 2 sets forth the data used to estimate the burden associated with manufacturers' submissions to the Database. We observed that a large percentage of the general comments come from a few businesses and assumed that the experience of a business that submits many comments each year would be different from one that submits only a few. Accordingly, we divided all responding businesses into three groups, based on the number of general comments submitted in FY 2015; and then we selected several businesses from each group to contact. The first group we contacted consisted of businesses that submitted 50 or more comments in FY 2015, accounting for 31 percent of all general comments received. The second group we contacted included businesses that submitted 6 to 49 comments, accounting for 39 percent of all general comments

received. The last group contacted included businesses that submitted no more than five comments, accounting for 30 percent of all general comments received.<sup>4</sup> We asked each company contacted how long it typically takes to research, compose, and enter a comment, a claim of materially inaccurate information, or a confidential information claim.

To estimate the burden associated with submitting a general comment through the business portal regarding a report of harm, we averaged the burden provided by each company within each group and then calculated a weighted average from the three groups, weighting each group by the proportion of comments received from that group. We found that the average time to submit a general comment regarding a report of harm is 117 minutes based on the data in Table 3 (((15 minutes + 45 minutes + 30 minutes + 15 minutes)/4 companies)\*.31 + ((105 minutes + 45 minutes + 150 minutes + 15 minutes)/4 companies)\*.39 + ((240 minutes + 60 minutes + 480 minutes)/3 companies)\*.30 = 117 minutes).

TABLE 3—ESTIMATED BURDEN TO ENTER A GENERAL COMMENT IN THE DATABASE

Group	Company	General comments
Group 1 (>=50 comments) .....	Company A .....	15
	Company B .....	45
	Company C .....	30
	Company D .....	15
Group 2 (6–49 comments) .....	Company A .....	105
	Company B .....	45
	Company C .....	150
	Company D .....	15

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Table 9 of the Employer Costs for Employee Compensation (ECEC), Private Industry, goods-producing and service-providing industries,

by occupational group, June 2016 (data extracted on 06/23/2016 from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t09.htm>

<sup>4</sup> In the last group one company was excluded as an outlier.

TABLE 3—ESTIMATED BURDEN TO ENTER A GENERAL COMMENT IN THE DATABASE—Continued

Group	Company	General comments
Group 3 (≤ 5 comments) .....	Company A .....	240
	Company B .....	60
	Company C .....	480

Registered businesses generally submit comments through our Web site. Unregistered businesses submit comments by mail, email, or fax. We estimate that for unregistered businesses, submitting comments takes a little longer because we often must ask the businesses to amend their submissions to include the required certifications. Thus, we estimated that on average, comments submitted by mail, email, or fax take 30 minutes longer than those submitted through our Web site (117 minutes + 30 minutes = 147 minutes).

The submission of a claim of materially inaccurate information is a relatively rare event for all respondents. Accordingly, we averaged all responses together. Eight of the businesses contacted had submitted claims of materially inaccurate information. We found that the average time to submit a claim that a report of harm contains a material inaccuracy is 165 minutes ((30 minutes + 90 minutes + 45 minutes + 90 minutes + 60 minutes + 660 minutes + 45 minutes + 300 minutes)/8 companies = 165 minutes).

Registered businesses generally submit claims through the business portal. Unregistered businesses submit claims by mail, email, or fax. We estimate that submitting claims by mail, email, or fax takes a little longer because we often must ask the businesses to amend their submission to include the required certifications. Thus, we estimated that on average, claims submitted by mail, email, or fax take 30 minutes longer than those submitted through our Web site (165 minutes + 30 minutes = 195 minutes).

The submission of a claim of confidential information is a relatively rare event for all respondents; accordingly, we averaged all responses together. Five of the businesses contacted had submitted claims of confidential information. We found that the average time to submit a claim that a report of harm contains confidential information is 42 minutes ((45 minutes + 15 minutes + 60 minutes + 30 minutes + 60 minutes)/5 companies = 42 minutes).

Registered businesses generally submit confidential information claims through the business portal.

Unregistered businesses submit confidential information claims by mail, email, or fax. We estimate that submitting claims in this way takes a little longer because we often must ask the businesses to amend their submission to include the required certifications. Thus, we estimate that a confidential information claim submitted by mail, email, or fax would take 30 minutes longer than those submitted through our Web site (42 minutes + 30 minutes = 72 minutes).

For voluntary brand identification, we estimate that a response would take 10 minutes on average. Most responses consist only of the brand name and a product description. In many cases a business will submit multiple entries in a brief period of time and, based on the date and time stamps on these records, an entry often takes less than two minutes. CPSC staff enters the same data in a similar form based on our own research, and that experience was also factored into our estimate.

For small batch manufacturer identification, we estimate that a response would take 10 minutes on average. The form consists of three check boxes and the information should be readily accessible to the respondent.

The responses summarized in Table 2 are generally submitted by manufacturers. To avoid underestimating the cost associated with the collection of this data, we assigned the higher hourly wage associated with a manager or professional in goods-producing industries to these tasks. To estimate the cost of manufacturer submissions we multiplied the estimated total burden hours in Table 2 (8,826 hours) by an estimated total compensation for a manager or professional in goods-producing industries of \$68.67 per hour,<sup>5</sup> which results in an estimated cost of \$606,081 (8,826 hours × \$68.67 per hour = \$606,081).

Therefore, the total estimated annual cost to respondents is \$719,381

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Table 9 of the Employer Costs for Employee Compensation (ECEC), Private Industry, goods-producing and service-providing industries, by occupational group, June 2016 (data extracted on 06/23/2016 from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t09.htm>).

(\$113,300 burden for reports of harm + \$606,081 burden for manufacturer submissions = \$719,381).

## 2. Estimated Annual Burden on Government

We estimate the annualized cost to the CPSC to be \$954,531. This figure is based on the costs for four categories of work for the Database: Reports of Harm, Materially Inaccurate Information Claims, Manufacturer Comments, and Small Batch Identification. Each category is described below. No government cost is associated with Voluntary Brand Identification because this information is entered directly into the Database by the manufacturer with no processing required by the government. The information assists the government in directing reports of harm to the correct manufacturer. We did not attempt to calculate separately the government cost for claims of confidential information because the number of claims is so small. The time to process these claims is included with claims of materially inaccurate information.

*Reports of Harm:* The Reports of Harm category includes many different tasks. Some costs related to this category are from two data entry contracts. Tasks related to these contracts include clerical coding of the report, such as identifying the type of consumer product reported and the appropriate associated hazard, as well as performing quality control on the data in the report. Contractor A spends an estimated 5,267 hours per year performing these tasks. With an hourly rate of \$33.31 for contractor services, the annual cost to the government of contract A is \$175,444. Contractor B spends an estimated 2,539 hours per year performing these tasks. With an hourly rate of \$58.09 for contractor services, the annual cost to the government of contract B is \$147,491.

The Reports of Harm category also includes sending consent requests for reports when necessary, processing that consent when received, determining whether a product is out of CPSC's jurisdiction, and confirming that pictures and attachments do not have any personally identifiable information. The Reports category also entails

notifying manufacturers when one of their products is reported, completing a risk of harm determination form for every report eligible for publication,

referring some reports to a Subject Matter Expert (SME) within the CPSC for a determination on whether the reports meet the requirement of having

a risk of harm, and determining whether a report meets all the statutory and regulatory requirements for publication. Detailed costs are:

TABLE 4—ESTIMATED COSTS FOR REPORTS OF HARM TASK

Grade level	Number of hours (annual)	Total compensation per hour	Total annual cost
Contract A .....	5,267	\$33.31	\$175,444
Contract B .....	2,539	58.09	147,491
7 .....	200	34.78	6,956
9 .....	300	42.69	12,807
12 .....	5,528	61.91	342,238
13 .....	428	73.37	31,402
14 .....	1,068	86.99	92,905
Total .....	15,330	.....	809,243

*Materially Inaccurate Information (MII) Claims:* The MII claims category includes reviewing and responding to

claims, participating in meetings where the claims are discussed, and completing a risk of harm determination

on reports when a company alleges that a report does not describe a risk of harm.

TABLE 5—ESTIMATED COSTS FOR MII CLAIMS TASK

Grade level	Number of hours (annual)	Total compensation per hour	Total annual cost
12 .....	275	\$61.91	\$17,025
13 .....	167	73.37	12,253
14 .....	323	86.99	28,098
15 .....	50	101.99	5,100
SES .....	50	109.97	5,499
Total .....	865	.....	67,975.00

*Manufacturer Comments:* The Comments category includes reviewing and accepting or rejecting comments.

TABLE 6—ESTIMATED COSTS FOR MANUFACTURER COMMENTS TASK

Grade level	Number of hours (annual)	Total compensation per hour	Total annual cost
12 .....	62	\$61.91	\$3,838
13 .....	109	73.37	7,997
Total .....	171	.....	11,835

*Small Batch Manufacturer Identification:* The Small Batch Manufacturer Identification category

includes time spent posting the list of small batch registrations, as well as answering manufacturers' questions on

registering as a Small Batch company and what the implications to that company of small batch registration.

TABLE 7—ESTIMATED COSTS FOR SMALL BATCH TASK

Grade level	Number of hours (annual)	Total compensation per hour	Total annual cost
15 .....	642	\$101.99	\$65,478
Total .....	642	.....	65,478

We estimate the annualized cost to the CPSC of \$954,531 by adding the four categories of work related to the Database summarized in Tables 4 through 7 (Reports of Harm (\$809,243) + MII Claims (\$67,975) + Manufacturer Comments (\$11,835) + Small Batch Identification (\$65,478) = \$954,531).

This information collection renewal request based on an estimated 12,360 burden hours per year for the Database is a decrease of 7,485 hours since this collection of information was last approved by OMB in 2013. The decrease in burden is due primarily to the fact that the number of incoming reports of harm has decreased, and the number of claims based on those reports has decreased as well. While comments did not decline significantly, they did shift to the more efficient online submissions. We note a large increase in small batch manufacturer activity, which has been rising steadily for years. However, this increase was not large enough to offset the decreases in other areas.

Dated: November 3, 2016.

**Todd A. Stevenson,**

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016-26963 Filed 11-7-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6355-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Performance Review Board Membership

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the names of members of a Performance Review Board for the Department of the Army.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* November 01, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Barbara Smith, Civilian Senior Leader Management Office, 111 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0111.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4314(c)(1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations, one or more Senior Executive Service performance review boards. The boards shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of senior executives' performance by supervisors and make recommendations to the appointing authority or rating official relative to the performance of these executives.

The Department of the Army Performance Review Board will be

composed of a subset of the following individuals:

1. Ms. Lisha Adams, Executive Deputy to the Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
2. LTG Joseph Anderson, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7, Department of the Army.
3. LTG Robert P. Ashley Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of the Army.
4. Mr. Stephen D. Austin, Assistant Chief of the Army Reserve, Office of the Chief Army Reserve.
5. LTG Gwendolyn Bingham, Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Department of the Army.
6. Dr. Joseph L. Corriveau, Director, Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, U.S. Army Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command.
7. Mr. James C. Dalton, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
8. Ms. Gwendolyn R. DeFilippi, Director, Civilian Senior Leader Management Office, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).
9. Ms. Steffanie B. Easter, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Policy and Logistics, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology).
10. Ms. Sue A. Engelhardt, Director of Human Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
11. Mr. Randall L. Exley, The Auditor General, U.S. Army, Office of the Auditor General.
12. Mr. Richard Fong, Senior Research Scientist (Warheads Technology), U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center (ARDEC), U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command.
13. Ms. Susan J. Goodyear, Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
14. Mr. Patrick K. Hallinan, Executive Director of the Army National Cemeteries Program, Department of the Army.
15. Mr. Stuart A. Hazlett, Director of Contracting, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
16. Ms. Ellen M. Helmeron, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.
17. Mr. David Jimenez, Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army/Director of Test and Evaluation.
18. MG Donald E. Jackson, Jr., Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

19. MG Daniel I. Karbler, Commanding General, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command.

20. Ms. Krystyna M. A. Kolesar, Deputy Director, Program Analysis & Evaluation Directorate, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8.

21. Mr. Mark R. Lewis, Executive Advisor to the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, Office of the Administrative Assistant.

22. LTG Kevin W. Mangum, Deputy Commanding General/Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

23. Mr. David Markowitz, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8.

24. Mr. Joseph M. McDade, Principal Deputy General Counsel of the Air Force.

25. Ms. Kathleen S. Miller, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (G-3/5/7), Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7.

26. Mr. William F. Moore, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4.

27. Mr. Levator Norsworthy Jr., Deputy General Counsel(Acquisition)/Senior Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel.

28. Mr. Gerald B. O'Keefe, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army.

29. Mr. Philip R. Park, Principal Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel.

30. LTG Gustave F. Perna, Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command.

31. Mr. Dean E. Pfoztzer, Principal Director, Policy and Resources/Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer/G-6.

32. Mr. David W. Pittman, Deputy Director, Engineer Research and Development Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

33. Mr. Vic S. Ramdass, Director for Partnering USSOUTHCOM, U.S. Southern Command.

34. Ms. Diane M. Randon, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management.

35. Mr. Jeffrey N. Rapp, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2 Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2.

36. Dr. Jaques Reifman, Senior Research Scientist (Advanced Medical Technology), U.S. Army Medical Research Materiel Command.

37. Mr. J. Randall Robinson, Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Energy and