

or solicitation; (ii) the telehealth technologies must be provided for the purpose of furnishing telehealth services related to the patient's ESRD; and (iii) the provision of the telehealth technologies must "meet[] any other requirements set forth in regulations promulgated by the Secretary."

i. For the purposes of this exception, please provide input on how "telehealth technologies" should be defined. Please provide examples of telehealth technologies that may be used to furnish telehealth services related to a beneficiary's ESRD (e.g., technologies that address services on the Medicare telehealth list). Also, please indicate whether telehealth technologies should include services. If so, please explain, in detail, what services should be considered "telehealth technologies."

ii. For the purposes of this exception, should OIG include protections or safeguards as "any other requirements set forth in regulations promulgated by the Secretary?" If so, please explain what protections or safeguards and why.

#### 4. Intersection of Physician Self-Referral Law and Anti-Kickback Statute

Please share any feedback regarding specific circumstances in which (i) exceptions to the physician self-referral law and safe harbors to the anti-kickback statute should align for purposes of the goals of this RFI; and (ii) exceptions to the physician self-referral law in furtherance of care coordination or value-based care should not have a corresponding safe harbor to the anti-kickback statute.

Respondents are encouraged to provide complete but concise and organized responses, including any relevant data and specific examples. Respondents are not required to address every issue or respond to every question discussed in this RFI to have their responses considered. All responses will be considered, provided they contain information OIG can use to identify the commenter.

Please note: This is a request for information only. This RFI is issued solely for information and planning purposes; it does not constitute a Request for Proposal (RFP), application, proposal abstract, or quotation. This RFI does not commit the U.S. Government to contract for any supplies or services or make a grant award. Further, OIG is not seeking proposals through this RFI and will not accept unsolicited proposals. Respondents are advised that the U.S. Government will not pay for any information or administrative costs incurred in response to this RFI; all costs associated with responding to this RFI will be solely at the interested

party's expense. Not responding to this RFI does not preclude participation in any future procurement, if conducted. It is the responsibility of the potential responders to monitor this RFI announcement for additional information pertaining to this request. Please note that OIG will not respond to questions about the policy issues raised in this RFI. Contractor support personnel may be used to review RFI responses.

Responses to this RFI are not offers and cannot be accepted by the U.S. Government to form a binding contract or issue a grant. Information obtained as a result of this RFI may be used by the U.S. Government for program planning on a nonattribution basis. Respondents should not include any information that might be considered proprietary or confidential. This RFI should not be construed as a commitment or authorization to incur costs for which reimbursement would be required or sought. All submissions become U.S. Government property and will not be returned. OIG may publicly post the comments received or a summary thereof.

#### IV. Collection of Information Requirements

This document does not impose information collection requirements, that is, reporting, recordkeeping, or third-party disclosure requirements. However, section III of this document does contain a general solicitation of comments in the form of a request for information. In accordance with the implementing regulations of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), specifically 5 CFR 1320.3(h)(4), this general solicitation is exempt from the PRA. Facts or opinions submitted in response to general solicitations of comments from the public, published in the **Federal Register** or other publications, regardless of the form or format thereof, provided that no person is required to supply specific information pertaining to the commenter, other than that necessary for self-identification, as a condition of the agency's full consideration, are not generally considered information subject to the PRA. Consequently, there is no need for review by the Office of Management and Budget under the authority of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

#### V. Response to Comments

Because of the large number of public comments we normally receive on **Federal Register** documents, we are not able to acknowledge or respond to them individually. We will consider all

comments we receive by the date and time specified in the **DATES** section of this preamble, and, if we proceed with a subsequent document, we may respond to the comments in the preamble to that document.

Dated: August 20, 2018.

**Daniel R. Levinson,**  
*Inspector General.*

[FR Doc. 2018-18519 Filed 8-24-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4152-01-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Office of the Secretary

#### 43 CFR Part 11

[Docket No. DOI-2018-0006; XXXD5198NI.  
DS61600000.DNINR0000.000000.DX61604]

RIN 1090-AB17

#### Natural Resource Damages for Hazardous Substances

**AGENCY:** Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment, Interior.

**ACTION:** Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment (ORDA) is seeking comments and suggestions from State, Tribal, and Federal natural resource trustees, other affected parties, and the interested public on whether revisions to the regulations for conducting natural resource damage assessments and restoration (NRDAR) for hazardous substance releases are needed, and if so, what specific revisions should be considered.

**DATES:** We will accept comments through October 26, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments to ORDA on this ANPRM by any of the following methods. Please reference the Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) DOI-2018-0006 in your comments.

- *Electronically:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. In the "Search" box enter "DOI-2018-0006." Follow the instructions to submit public comments. We will post all comments.

- Hand deliver or mail comments to the Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street Northwest, Mail Stop/Room 5538, Washington, DC 20240.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steve Glomb, Director, Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment at (202) 208-4863 or email to [steve\\_glomb@ios.doi.gov](mailto:steve_glomb@ios.doi.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The regulations provide procedures that State, Tribal, and Federal natural resource co-trustees may use to evaluate the need for and means of restoring, replacing, or acquiring the equivalent of public natural resources that are injured or destroyed because of releases of hazardous substances into the environment. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)—which authorizes natural resource damage claims by States, federally recognized Indian Tribes, and the Federal government—specifies that the regulations are optional, but if the State, Tribal, and Federal governments (described as natural resource “co-trustees” by CERCLA) utilize them, they are entitled to a “rebuttable presumption” on their claim in any subsequent legal proceeding.

This notice seeks comment and suggestions in response to the CERCLA biennial review requirement and Executive Order 13777 (February 24, 2017), which directed the Department of the Interior (DOI) and other Federal agencies to establish Regulatory Reform Task Forces to evaluate existing regulations and make recommendations regarding repeal, replacement, or modification, consistent with applicable law.

### Background

CERCLA authorizes the Federal government, States, and federally recognized Indian Tribes to act as “trustees” on behalf of the public, for the purpose of bringing claims for injury to natural resources injured or destroyed by hazardous substance releases. Such claims are not fines or penalties, and the measure of damages is calculated by the cost to restore or replace the injured or destroyed natural resources. Trustees may also recover compensation for services the resources would have provided to the public pending restoration, along with the reasonable cost of assessing injury and determining appropriate restoration. The statute requires trustees to spend restoration recoveries “only to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent” of injured natural resources pursuant to a publicly reviewed restoration plan.

Section 301(c) of CERCLA requires the promulgation of regulations to guide natural resource damage assessment and restoration. The statute explicitly provides that the regulations are not mandatory, but if State, Tribal, or Federal trustees conduct an assessment in accordance with the regulations, they would receive a “rebuttable presumption” for their claim in any

subsequent administrative or judicial proceeding. The Department of the Interior (DOI) was designated by the President to develop the regulations currently in effect at 43 CFR part 11.

DOI previously developed two types of NRDAR regulations (as specified by CERCLA). Standard procedures for simplified assessments requiring minimal field observations (the Type A Rule); and site-specific procedures for detailed assessment in individual cases (the Type B Rule). The CERCLA NRDAR Regulations were last revised in 2008. These revisions to the Type B Rule emphasized natural resource restoration over litigation and monetary damages, made technical corrections to procedural timing inconsistencies, and responded to two court decisions addressing previous versions of the regulations: *State of Ohio v. U.S. Department of the Interior*, 880 F.2d 432 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (*Ohio v. Interior*); and *Kennecott Utah Copper Corp. v. U.S. Department of the Interior*, 88 F.3d 1191 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (*Kennecott v. Interior*).

The 2008 revisions were based on the report of a committee convened by DOI under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) to make recommendations on improving NRDAR practice. The committee was comprised of representatives from States, Tribes, Federal agencies, industrial corporations, industry consultants and attorneys, local and national non-governmental organizations, and academics. Unlike previous iterations of the NRDAR regulations, the final regulatory revisions based on the FACA Committee report were not challenged by States, Tribes, industry or environmental groups.

### Description of Information Requested

We are interested in comments or suggestions that improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the NRDAR process. An internal biennial review of the CERCLA NRDAR regulations identified some remaining issues from the NRDAR FACA Committee Report that could be addressed, and NRDAR practice issues that have developed or progressed since the last revision of the regulations. DOI is particularly interested in comments and suggestions related to these issues, outlined below. We also welcome comments and suggestions on any other aspect of the regulations that trustees, stakeholders, and the general public would like us to consider.

#### *Simplification and “Plain Language”*

With the exceptions of the provision of the Type B Regulations that were revised in 2008, the CERCLA NRDAR

regulations are arguably complicated, overly prescriptive, repetitive, and dense—particularly when compared to the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) NRDAR Rule promulgated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration at 15 CFR part 990. A number of stakeholders have suggested that DOI should consider a comprehensive “plain English” revision to the CERCLA NRDAR Regulations that closely aligns with the structure of the existing OPA NRDAR Regulations.

#### *Type A Regulations*

The Type A Regulations were designed to result in efficient, cost effective, standardized assessments. It has been challenging, however, to develop workable Type A Regulations that are streamlined and utilize minimal actual field observations but are still relevant and reliable enough to be entitled to a rebuttable presumption of correctness. Accordingly, DOI is seeking comments or suggestions regarding revision to and utilization of the CERCLA NRDAR Type A Regulations.

#### *Early Emphasis on Restoration Over Damages*

The NRDAR FACA Committee Report recommended that DOI could encourage a restoration focus and negotiated agreements by revising the regulations to encourage early scoping of restoration opportunities at NRDAR sites. DOI is interested in any additional comments or suggestions on where specifically in the assessment process restoration scoping may be cost effective and appropriate and how that could best be addressed in the regulations.

#### *Procedures to Further Encourage Negotiated Settlements and Early Restoration*

Since the last revision of CERCLA NRDAR Regulations, a number of matters have utilized partial negotiated settlements early in the assessment process to cost effectively resolve discrete NRDAR claims and re-enforce an overall restoration focus for ultimate comprehensive resolution. However, the current regulations offer little guidance on how to align early restoration settlements with existing statutory and regulatory requirements for assessment and restoration planning.

#### *Advance Restoration and Restoration Banking*

Restoration “banking” and advance restoration—where restoration is undertaken in anticipation of marketing portions of such restoration to responsible parties to address natural resource injury caused by releases of

hazardous substances—has been considered at a number of sites since the last revision of the CERCLA NRDAR regulations. Some States (such as Louisiana) have enacted specific statutory provisions and promulgated regulations on NRDAR banking. The existing CERCLA NRDAR regulations do not provide any guidance on the use of advance restoration and restoration banking techniques.

#### *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance*

The NRDAR FACA Committee Report encouraged DOI to adopt Department-wide categorical exclusions from NEPA as appropriate and to ensure that compliance with NEPA requirements occurs concurrently with NRDAR restoration planning. DOI is interested in comments or suggestions whether that would best be addressed in the NRDAR regulations, NEPA regulations, or in Departmental guidance.

#### **Public Comment Procedures**

DOI is not obligated to consider comments that we receive after the close of the comment period for this ANPRM, or comments that are delivered to an address other than those listed in this notice. After the comment period for this ANPRM closes, DOI will review all comment submissions. Upon consideration, DOI may publish a notice of proposed rulemaking.

We are particularly interested in receiving comments and suggestions about the topics identified in the *Description of Information Requested* section. Written comments that are specific, explain the rationale for the comment or suggestion, address the issues outlined in this notice, and where possible, refer to specific statutes, existing regulations, case law, or NRDAR practices are most useful.

Before including your address, phone number, email address or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—might be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review we cannot guarantee that we will do so.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 9601, secs. 104,107,111(I), 122.

#### **Steve Glomb,**

*Director, Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment.*

[FR Doc. 2018-18498 Filed 8-24-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4334-63-P**

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 73**

[MB Docket No. 18-214, GN Docket No. 12-268; FCC 18-113]

#### **LPTV, TV Translator, and FM Broadcast Station Reimbursement, Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Commission proposes rules to implement Congress's recent directive that we reimburse certain Low Power Television (LPTV), television translator (TV translator), and FM broadcast stations for costs incurred as a result of the Commission's broadcast television spectrum incentive auction. When Congress authorized the Commission to conduct the incentive auction, it required the Commission to reimburse certain costs incurred by full power and Class A television licensees and multichannel video program distributors (MVPDs). On March 23, 2018, Congress adopted the Reimbursement Expansion Act (REA), which, among other things, expands the list of entities eligible to be reimbursed for auction-related expenses to include LPTV, TV translator, and FM broadcast stations, and to provide additional funds to the Reimbursement Fund to be used for this purpose. The REA requires the Commission to complete a rulemaking to adopt a reimbursement process for LPTV, TV translator, and FM stations within a year from the adoption date of the Act. This NPRM commences the proceeding to implement this directive and enable the Commission to meet this statutory deadline.

**DATES:** Comments may be filed on or before September 26, 2018; and reply comments may be filed on or before October 26, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested parties may submit comments and reply comments, identified by MB Docket No. 18-214 and GN Docket No. 12-268, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Federal Communications Commission's website:* <http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or

overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- *People with Disabilities:* Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by email: [FCC504@fcc.gov](mailto:FCC504@fcc.gov) or phone: (202) 418-0530 or TTY: (202) 418-0432. For detailed instructions for submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the supplementary information section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kim Matthews of the FCC's Media Bureau, Policy Division, [Kim.Matthews@fcc.gov](mailto:Kim.Matthews@fcc.gov), (202) 418-2154.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), FCC 18-113, adopted August 2, 2018 and released August 3, 2018. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. The complete text may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554. This document will also be available via ECFS at <http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/>. Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Microsoft Word, and/or Adobe Acrobat. Alternative formats are available for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format) by sending an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or calling the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (voice), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

The NPRM may result in new or revised information collection requirements. If the Commission adopts any new or revised information collection requirements, the Commission will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** inviting the public to comment on such requirements, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, the Commission will seek specific comment on how it might "further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees."

#### **Synopsis**

##### **I. Introduction**

1. In the NPRM, we propose rules to implement Congress's recent directive