calibration standards, calibration curves, completed visible emissions observation forms, a calculation of the average destruction efficiency and combustion efficiency over the course of each test, the date, time and duration of the test, the waste gas composition and NHV_{cz} and/or LFL_{cz} the gas tested, the flowrate (at standard conditions) and velocity of the waste gas, the MPGF burner tip pressure, waste gas temperature, meteorological conditions (*e.g.,* ambient temperature, and barometric pressure, wind speed and direction, relative humidity), and whether there were any observed flare flameouts.

(ii) If an engineering assessment is done, sources must provide to the agency a demonstration that a proper level of destruction/combustion efficiency was obtained, through prior performance testing or the like for a similar equivalent burner type design. To support an equivalent burner assessment of destruction/combustion efficiency, sources must discuss and provide information related to design principles of burner type, burner size, burner geometry, air-fuel mixing, and the combustion principles associated with this burner that will assure smokeless operation under a variety of operating conditions. Similarly, sources must also provide details outlining why all of these factors, in concert with the waste gas that was tested in the supporting reference materials, support the conclusion that the MPGF burners being proposed for use by the source will achieve at least an equivalent level of destruction efficiency as required by the underlying applicable regulations.

(4) Long-Term MPGF Stability Testing

(a) The operation of a MPGF with a stable, lit flame is of paramount importance to continuously ensuring good flare performance; therefore, any source wishing to demonstrate equivalency for purposes of using these types of installations must conduct a long-term stability performance test. Since flare tip design and waste gas composition have significant impact on the range of stable operation, sources should use a representative waste gas the MPGF will typically burn or a waste gas, such as an olefin or olefinic mixture, that will challenge the MPGF to perform at a high level with a stable flame as well as challenge its smokeless capacity.

(b) Sources should first design and carry out a performance test to determine the point of flare flame instability and flameout for the MPGF burner and waste gas composition chosen to be tested. Successful, initial demonstration of stability is achieved when there is a stable, lit flame for a minimum of five minutes at consistent flow and waste gas composition. It is recommended, although not required, that sources determine the point of instability at sonic flow conditions or at the highest operating pressure anticipated. Any data which demonstrates instability and complete loss of flame prior to the five minute period must be reported along the initial stable flame demonstration. Along with destruction efficiency and combustion efficiency, the data elements laid out in 3(a)(i) should also be reported.

(c) Using the results from (b) above as a starting point, sources must perform a minimum of three replicate tests at both the minimum and maximum operating conditions on at least one MPGF burner at or above the NHV_{cz} or at or below the LFL_{cz} determined in 4(b). If more than one burner is tested, the spacing between the burners must be representative of the projected installation. Each test must be a minimum of 15-minutes in duration with constant flow and composition for the three runs at minimum conditions, and the three runs at the maximum conditions. The data and data elements mentioned in 4(b) must also be reported.

(5) MPGF Cross-light Testing

(a) Sources must design and carryout a performance test to successfully demonstrate that cross-lighting of the MPGF burners will occur over the range of operating conditions (*e.g.,* operating pressure and/or velocity (Mach) condition) for which the burners will be used. Sources may use the NHV_{cz} and/or LFL_{cz} established in 4 above and perform a minimum of three replicate runs at each of the operating conditions. Sources must cross-light a minimum of three burners and the spacing between the burners and location of the pilot flame must be representative of the projected installation. At a minimum, sources must report the following: A description of the testing, a protocol describing the test methodology used, associated test method QA/QC parameters, the waste gas composition and NHV_{cz} and/or LFL_{cz} of the gas tested, the velocity (or Mach speed ratio) of the waste gas tested, the MPGF burner tip pressure, the time, length, and duration of the test, records of whether a successful cross-light was observed over all of the burners and the length of time it took for the burners to cross-light, records of maintaining a stable flame after a successful cross-light and the duration for which this was observed, records of any smoking events during the cross-light, waste gas temperature, meteorological conditions (*e.g.,* ambient temperature, and barometric pressure, wind speed and direction, relative humidity), and whether there were any observed flare flameouts.

(6) Flaring Reduction Considerations

(a) Sources must make a demonstration, considering MPGF utilization, on whether additional flare reduction measures, including flare gas recovery, should be utilized and implemented.

(7) MPGF Monitoring and Operating Conditions

(a) Based on the results of the criteria mentioned above in this section, sources must make recommendations to the agency on the type of monitoring and operating conditions necessary for the MPGF to demonstrate equivalent reductions in emissions as compared to flares complying with the requirements at 40 CFR 60.18 and 40 CFR 63.11, taking into consideration a control scheme designed to handle highly variable flows and waste gas compositions.

We solicit comment on all aspects of this framework. We anticipate this framework would enable the agency to review and approve future AMEL requests for MPGF installations in a more expeditious timeframe because we anticipate that the information required by the framework would provide us with sufficient information to evaluate future AMEL requests. We note that all aspects of future AMEL requests would still be subject to a notice and comment proceeding.

Dated: August 20, 2015.

Janet G. McCabe,

Acting Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015–21420 Filed 8–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 67

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–B–1149]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations for Jackson County, Arkansas, and Incorporated Areas

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is withdrawing its proposed rule concerning proposed flood elevation

determinations for Jackson County, Arkansas, and Incorporated Areas.

DATES: This withdrawal is effective on August 31, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. FEMA–B–1149 to Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 2, 2010, FEMA published a proposed rulemaking at 75 FR 67319, proposing flood elevation determinations along one or more flooding sources in Jackson County, Arkansas, and Incorporated Areas. FEMA is withdrawing the proposed rulemaking.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4104; 44 CFR 67.4.

Dated: August 20, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2015–21507 Filed 8–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 5

[ET Docket Nos. 10–236, 06–155; FCC 15–76]

Radio Experimentation and Market Trials

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission proposes to modify the rules for program experimental licenses to permit experimentation for radio frequency (RF)-based medical devices, if the device being tested is designed to comply with all applicable service rules in Part 18, Industrial, Scientific, and Medical Equipment; Part 95, Personal Radio Services Subpart H—Wireless Medical Telemetry Service; or Part 95, Subpart I—Medical Device Radiocommunication Service. This proposal is designed to establish parity between all qualified medical device manufacturers for conducting basic research and clinical trials with RF-based medical devices as to permissible frequencies of operation.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before September 30, 2015 and reply comments must be filed on or before October 15, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by ET Docket Nos. 10–236 and 06–155, by any of the following methods:

- Federal Communications Commission's Web site: *http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- People with Disabilities: Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by email: *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: Rodney Small, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 418–2452, email: *Rodney.Small@fcc.gov,* TTY (202) 418–2989.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM),* ET Docket Nos. 10–236 and 06–155, FCC 15–76, adopted July 6, 2015, and released July 8, 2015. The full text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room CY–A257), 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. The full text may also be downloaded at: *www.fcc.gov.* People with Disabilities: To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice), 202–418–0432 (tty).

Summary of Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

1. In two April 2015 filings, Medtronic, Inc. (Medtronic) observes that program licenses ''may not be issued for operation on frequencies listed in § 15.205 of the rules, which includes the 401–406 MHz Medical Device Radiocommunications Service ('MedRadio') band often employed by makers of implanted and body-worn medical devices.'' Medical testing licensees, on the other hand, may use those frequencies, if they comply with applicable service rules. Medtronic therefore argues that this disparity in frequencies contributes to program licensees being less flexible than medical testing licensees.

2. As discussed in the companion *Memorandum Opinion & Order* in this proceeding, basic medical research and experimentation would be conducted under a program (or conventional) license by any manufacturer of RF-based medical devices, whether that manufacturer is eligible for a medical testing license or not. The Commission created the program experimental license to reduce regulatory delay and uncertainty and to promote innovation. A program license is granted for a five year term and allows the licensee to conduct multiple unrelated experiments within a broad range of frequencies. Because researchers can modify the scope of their experiments without having to obtain Commission permission to do so, the flexibility provided will accelerate innovation in RF technology, including RF-based medical devices. However, the program license rules do not permit experimentation in frequency bands that are restricted under § 15.205(a) of the Commission's Rules to protect the many safety-of-life and passive services that operate in these bands.

3. Medtronic rightly points out that the 401–406 MHz band is a restricted band under § 15.205(a) and is not available for basic research under the program license rules. However, the 401–406 MHz band is used for implanted and body worn medical devices under the part 95 MedRadio rules. Consequently, manufacturers of certain RF-based medical devices cannot take advantage of the benefits provided by a program license to advance innovation in this area, even though the devices they ultimately develop could be authorized for use under the Commission's rules. Because clinical trials conducted under the medical testing license or as a market trial may be tested in these bands, the Commission sees no reason to impose greater frequency restrictions on program licensees conducting basic research on the same devices.

4. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to modify the rules for program licenses to permit experimentation on frequencies listed in § 15.205(a) of the Commission's rules, provided that—comparable to the rules for medical testing licenses—the device being tested is designed to comply with all applicable service rules in part 18,