Claimants found disabled under the listings at step three of the sequential evaluation process have impairments that we consider severe enough to prevent any gainful activity, regardless of the claimant's age, education, or work experience. Our policy is that listing 1.04A specifies a level of severity that is only met when all of the medical criteria listed in paragraph A are simultaneously present: (1) Neuro-anatomic distribution of pain, (2) limitation of motion of the spine, (3) motor loss (atrophy with associated muscle weakness or muscle weakness) accompanied by sensory or reflex loss, and, (4) if there is involvement of the lower back, positive straight-leg raising test (sitting and supine). Listing 1.04A uses the conjunction ''and'' when enumerating the medical criteria in order to establish that the entire set of criteria must be present at the same time on examination. When this set of criteria is present on examination, the individual has the clinical presentation we expect from a person who suffers from nerve root compression that is so severe that it would preclude any gainful activity. 20 CFR 404.1525(a), 416.925(a).

On the other hand, when the listing criteria are scattered over time, wax and wane, or are present on one examination but absent on another, the individual's nerve root compression would not rise to the level of severity required by listing 1.04A. An individual who shows only some of the criteria on examination presents a different, less severe clinical picture than someone with the full set of criteria present simultaneously. To meet the severity required by the listing, our policy requires the simultaneous presence of all of the medical criteria in listing 1.04A.

In addition to meeting the severity requirement, in order to meet the duration requirement, the simultaneous presence of all of the medical criteria in paragraph A must continue, or be expected to continue, for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 20 CFR 404.1525(c)(4), 416.925(c)(4). The ''duration'' requirement follows from two provisions in the Social Security Act. First, sections 223(d)(1)(A) and 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Act define ''disability'' as an inability ''to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.'' Second, sections 223(d)(2)(A) and 1614(a)(3)(B) of the Act state that ''[a]n individual shall be determined to be under a disability only if his physical or mental impairment or impairments are of such severity that he is not only unable to do his previous work but cannot, considering his age, education, and work experience, engage in any other kind of substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. . . .'' Thus, an impairment that lasts or is expected to last 12 months is not sufficient to establish disability. The impairment must also be severe enough to prevent the claimant from engaging in substantial gainful work. As the Supreme Court of the United States explained in *Barnhart* v. *Walton,* 535 U.S. 212, 218 (2002): ''In other words, the statute, in the two provisions, specifies that the 'impairment' must last 12 months and also be severe enough to prevent the claimant from engaging in any 'substantial gainful work.' ''

Accordingly, our policy requires that for a disorder of the spine to meet listing 1.04A at step three in the sequential evaluation process, the claimant must establish the simultaneous presence of all the medical criteria in paragraph A. Once this level of severity is established, the claimant must also show that this level of severity continued, or is expected to continue, for a continuous period of at least 12 months.

The court of appeals' decision differs from our policy because it held that listing 1.04A required a claimant to show only ''that each of the symptoms are present, and that the claimant has suffered or can be expected to suffer from nerve root compression continuously for at least 12 months.'' 734 F.3d at 294. Contrary to our policy that the requisite level of severity requires the simultaneous presence of all the medical criteria in paragraph A, the court of appeals held that a claimant need not show that each criterion was present simultaneously or in particularly close proximity. Accordingly, this holding is inconsistent with our interpretation of listing 1.04A and of the severity and durational requirements at step three of the sequential evaluation process.

EXPLANATION OF HOW WE WILL APPLY *RADFORD* WITHIN THE CIRCUIT: This Ruling applies only to claims in which the claimant resides in Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, or West Virginia at the time of the determination or decision at any level of administrative review.

In these States, in deciding whether a claimant's severe medically determinable disorder of the spine meets listing 1.04A, adjudicators will not require that all of the medical criteria in paragraph A appear simultaneously or in particularly close proximity. Rather, adjudicators will engage in what the court of appeals described as ''a more free-form, contextual inquiry that makes 12 months the relevant metric for the assessment of the claimant's duration of disability.''

Adjudicators will decide whether the evidence shows that all of the medical criteria in paragraph A are present within a continuous 12-month period (or, if there is less than 12 months of evidence in the record, that all the medical criteria are present and are expected to continue to be present). If all of the medical criteria are not present within a continuous 12-month period, adjudicators will determine that the disorder of the spine did not meet the listing.

If all of the medical criteria in paragraph A are present within a continuous 12-month period (or are expected to be present), adjudicators will then determine whether the evidence shows—as a whole—that the claimant's disorder of the spine caused, or is expected to cause, nerve root compression continuously for at least 12 months. In considering the severity of the nerve root compression, the medical criteria in paragraph A need not all be present simultaneously, nor in particularly close proximity. The nerve root compression must be severe enough, however, that the adjudicator can fairly conclude that it is still characterized by all of the medical criteria in paragraph A.

[FR Doc. 2015–24204 Filed 9–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9281]

Defense Trade Advisory Group; Notice of Open Meeting

SUMMARY: The Defense Trade Advisory Group (DTAG) will meet in open session from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. on Thursday, October 29, 2015 at 1777 F Street, NW., Washington, DC Entry and registration will begin at 12:30 p.m. The membership of this advisory committee consists of private sector defense trade representatives, appointed by the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, who advise the Department on policies, regulations, and technical issues affecting defense trade. The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss current defense trade issues and topics for further study.

The following agenda topics will be discussed: (1) Trade Compliance Process. Review of the current Voluntary Disclosure (VD) process and recommendations for possible improvements or changes (including analysis of how to address ''administrative'' VDs as distinguished from other VDs) while ensuring that foreign policy and national security interests are met; (2) Cyber Products. Review of ''cyber products'' and recommendations for which products, if any, should be included on the U.S. Munitions List, and potential impact on cyber products resulting from such export controls; (3) DTAG Structure and Operations. Examination of whether DTAG could function similar to the Commerce Department's Technical Advisory Committees (TACs), how DTAG could interface with such TACs, and whether State, Commerce and the Department of Defense should establish an interagency defense trade advisory group; and (4) Export Control Reform (ECR) status. Report on US industry views regarding licensing flexibilities and efficiencies (including availability of license exception, Strategic Trade Authorization), unintended consequences, and areas of potential improvements, resulting from the transfer of certain items from the jurisdiction of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (US Munitions List) to the jurisdiction of the Export Administration Regulations (Commerce Control List).

Members of the public may attend this open session and will be permitted to participate in the discussion in accordance with the Chair's instructions. Members of the public may, if they wish, submit a brief statement to the committee in writing.

As seating is limited to 125 persons, those wishing to attend the meeting must notify the DTAG Alternate Designated Federal Officer (DFO) by COB Monday, October 19, 2015. Members of the public requesting reasonable accommodation must also notify the DTAG Alternate DFO by that date. If notified after this date, the Department will be unable to accommodate requests due to requirements at the meeting location.

Each non-member observer or DTAG member that wishes to attend this plenary session should provide: His/her name and identifying data such as driver's license number, U.S. Government ID, or U.S. Military ID, to the DTAG Alternate DFO, Lisa Aguirre, via email at *DTAG@state.gov.* One of the following forms of valid photo identification will be required for admission to the meeting: U.S. driver's license, passport, U.S. Government ID or other valid photo ID.

For additional information, contact Ms. Glennis Gross-Peyton, PM/DDTC, SA–1, 12th Floor, Directorate of Defense Trade Controls, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC 20522–0112; telephone (202) 663–2862; FAX (202) 261–8199; or email *DTAG@state.gov.*

Dated: September 9, 2015.

Lisa V. Aguirre,

Alternate Designated Federal Officer, Defense Trade Advisory Group, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2015–24194 Filed 9–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–25–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Release Certain Properties From All Terms, Conditions, Reservations and Restrictions of a Quitclaim Deed Agreement Between the County of Palm Beach and the Federal Aviation Administration for the Palm Beach International Airport, West Palm Beach, FL

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The FAA hereby provides notice of intent to release approximately 0.21 acres at the Palm Beach International Airport, West Palm Beach, FL from the conditions, reservations, and restrictions as contained in a Quitclaim Deed agreement between the FAA and the County of Palm Beach, dated March 22, 1961. The release of property will allow the County of Palm Beach to dispose of the property for other than aeronautical purposes. The property is located along Florida Mango and Belvedere Road. The parcels are currently designated as non-aeronautical use. The property will be released of its federal obligations to grant an easement for right-of-way and stormwater retention. The fair market value of the right-of-way parcel and stormwater retention parcel has been determined to be $83,860 and $74,320, respectively. Documents reflecting the Sponsor's request are available, by appointment only, for inspection at the Palm Beach County Department of Airports at Palm Beach International Airport and the FAA Airports District Office.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 23, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Documents are available for review at the Palm Beach County Department of Airports at Palm Beach International Airport, and the FAA Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, FL 32822. Written comments on the Sponsor's request must be delivered or mailed to: Marisol C. Elliott, Program Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, FL 32822–5024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marisol C. Elliott, Program Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, FL 32822–5024.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 125 of The Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR–21) requires the FAA to provide an opportunity for public notice and comment prior to the ''waiver'' or ''modification'' of a sponsor's Federal obligation to use certain airport land for non-aeronautical purposes.

Issued in Orlando, Florida on September 14, 2015.

Bart Vernace,

Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, Southern Region.Revision Date 11/22/00

[FR Doc. 2015–24158 Filed 9–22–15; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be held on October 7, 2015—9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Round Room (10th Floor), Washington, DC 20591.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chinita A. Roundtree-Coleman at (609) 485–7149 or Web site at *chinita.roundtree-coleman@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C. App. 2), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Research, Engineering and Development (RE&D) Advisory Committee. The meeting agenda will include receiving from the