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AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Notice of Public Information Collection, Request for Comment on the Continued Use of the Partner Information Form (0412–0577) in Compliance With the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

AGENCY: U.S. Agency for International Development.

ACTION: 60-Day Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Agency for International Development invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This information collection was first approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2008, and the Partner Information Form has been used successfully in screening programs in West Bank/Gaza and elsewhere since the OMB approval.

DATES: The purpose of this notice is to allow 60 days from the date of its publication for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until September 15, 2015.

ADDRESSES: All submissions received must include the OMB Control Number 0412–0577 in the subject box, the agency name and Docket ID AID FRDQC_0001. To avoid duplicate submissions, please use only one of the following methods to submit comments:

(1) Online. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site at www.regulations.gov under e-Docket ID number AID FRDQC_0001; (2) Email. Submit comments to ghigginbotham@usaid.gov; (3) Mail. Submit written comments to George Higginbotham, Senior Management Policy Analyst, USAID, RRB, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20523

Written comments should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the continuing collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the burden estimates; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Direct requests for additional information regarding the collection listed in this notice, including requests for copies of the proposed collection instrument (PIF) and supporting documents, to George Higginbotham, Senior Management Policy Analyst, USAID, RRB, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20523 or at Ghigginbotham@usaid.gov.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

OMB Number: 200705–0412–003.

Form Number: 0412–0577.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) Type of Information Collection: Extension of Information Collection.

(2) Title of the Form/Collection: Partner Information Form.


(4) Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: The U.S. Agency for International Development intends to continue collection of information from individuals and/or officers of for-profit and not-for-profit non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who apply for USAID contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, other funding from USAID, or who apply for registration with USAID as Private and Voluntary Organizations. The collection of this information will be used to conduct screening to help mitigate the risk that USAID funds or USAID-funded activities inadvertently provide support to entities or individuals associated with terrorism. Screening programs are being conducted in West Bank/Gaza, Afghanistan, and pilot countries under the Partner Vetting System Pilot Program (Guatemala, Kenya, Lebanon, Philippines, and Ukraine).

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: USAID estimates that for pilot and non-pilot vetting programs, 3,800 PIFs will be completed in a calendar year and the additional requirements for partner vetting will add 1.25 hours (75 minutes) to an USAID acquisition or assistance award application.

(6) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: The total estimated annual burden associated with this collection is 4,750 hours (3,800 forms multiplied by 75 minutes per form, divided by 60 minutes).

(7) An estimate of the total public burden (in cost) associated with the collection: With the implementation of the partner requested secure portal, USAID has made the completion and modification of the PIF much easier for the implementing partner community. No start-up, capital, or maintenance costs to applicants are anticipated as a result of this collection.

Dated: July 6, 2015.

George Higginbotham,
[FR Doc. 2015–17567 Filed 7–16–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6116–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2015–0047]

Oral Rabies Vaccine Trial; Availability of a Supplemental Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of availability and request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has prepared a supplemental environmental assessment (EA) relative to an oral rabies vaccination field trial in New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia. The supplemental EA analyzes expanding the field trial for an experimental oral rabies vaccine for wildlife to additional areas in Ohio and increasing bait distribution density in
portions of West Virginia. The proposed field trial is necessary to evaluate whether the wildlife rabies vaccine will produce sufficient levels of population immunity against raccoon rabies. We are making the supplemental EA available to the public for review and comment.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before August 17, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:
• Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery: Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS–2015–0047, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238.

The supplemental environmental assessment and any comments we receive may be viewed at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/regulations/ws/ws_nepa_environmental_documents.shtml.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard Chipman, Rabies Program Coordinator, Wildlife Services, APHIS, 39 Chennell Drive, Suite 7, Concord, NH 03301; (603) 223–9623. To obtain copies of the supplemental environmental assessment, contact Ms. Beth Kabert, Staff Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Services, 140–C Locust Grove Road, Pittstown, NJ 08867; (908) 735–5654, fax (908) 735–0821, email: beth.e.kabert@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Wildlife Services (WS) program in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) cooperates with Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private individuals to research and implement the best methods of managing conflicts between wildlife and human health and safety, agriculture, property, and natural resources. Wildlife-borne diseases that can affect domestic animals and humans are among the types of conflicts that APHIS–WS addresses. Wildlife is the dominant reservoir of rabies in the United States. Currently, APHIS conducts an oral rabies vaccination (ORV) program to control the spread of rabies. The ORV program has utilized a vaccinia-rabies glycoprotein (V–RG) vaccine. APHIS–WS’ use of the V–RG vaccine has resulted in several notable accomplishments, including the elimination of canine rabies from sources in Mexico, the successful control of gray fox rabies virus variant in western Texas, and the prevention of any appreciable spread of raccoon rabies in the eastern United States. While the prevention of any appreciable spread of raccoon rabies in the eastern United States represents a major accomplishment in rabies management, the V–RG vaccine has not been effective in eliminating raccoon rabies from high-risk corridors. This fact prompted APHIS–WS to evaluate rabies vaccines capable of producing higher levels of population immunity against raccoon rabies to better control the spread of this disease.

In 2011, APHIS–WS initiated a field trial to study the immunogenicity and safety of a promising new wildlife rabies vaccine, human adenovirus type 5 rabies glycoprotein recombinant vaccine in portions of West Virginia, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service National Forest System lands. The vaccine used in this field trial is an experimental oral rabies vaccine called ONRAB (produced by Artemis Technologies Inc., Guelph, Ontario, Canada).

To further assess the immunogenicity of ONRAB in raccoons and skunks for raccoon rabies virus variant, APHIS–WS determined the need to expand the field trial into portions of New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia for the National Forest System lands. On July 9, 2012, we published in the Federal Register (77 FR 40322–40323, Docket No. APHIS–2012–0052) a notice 1 in which we announced the availability, for public review and comment, of an environmental assessment (EA) that examined the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed field trial to test the safety and efficacy of the ONRAB vaccine in New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia. We announced the availability of our final EA and finding of no significant impact in a notice published in the Federal Register (see footnote 1) on August 16, 2012 (77 FR 49409–49410, Docket No. APHIS–2012–0052). The field trial began in August 2012, taking place within approximately 10,483 square miles in portions of New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia, including portions of National Forest System lands, excluding Wilderness Areas. The field trial is a collaborative effort among APHIS–WS; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; the vaccine manufacturer; the appropriate agriculture, health, and wildlife agencies for the States of New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and West Virginia; the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources; and the Quebec Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife.

Given promising immunogenicity levels documented during the field trial of the ONRAB vaccine and the need for further field testing, APHIS is considering expanding the current field trial for the ONRAB vaccine in Ohio. APHIS has prepared a supplemental EA in which we analyze expanding the area of the field trial zone in Ohio to include Ashtabula and Trumbull Counties. This would add approximately 405 square miles to the field trial. In addition, the supplemental EA analyzes the impacts associated with increasing the ONRAB ORV bait distribution density from the program standard rate of 194–388 baits per square mile to 776 baits per square mile over a portion of the current field trial zones in West Virginia. The supplemental EA also analyzes a number of environmental issues or concerns with the ONRAB vaccine and activities associated with the field trial, such as capture and handling animals for monitoring and surveillance purposes with regard to the proposed action.

We are making the supplemental EA available to the public for review and comment. We will consider all comments that we receive on or before the date listed under the heading DATES at the beginning of this notice. The supplemental EA may be viewed on the Regulations.gov Web site or in our reading room (see ADDRESSES above for instructions for accessing Regulations.gov and information on the location and hours of the reading room). In addition, paper copies may be obtained by calling or writing to the individual listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

The EA has been prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508); (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS’ NEPA

1To view the notice, the comments we received, and the followup finding of no significant impact, go to http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2012-0052.
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Economic Research Service

Notice of Intent To Request Renewal of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Economic Research Service

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) implementing regulations, this notice announces the Economic Research Service’s (ERS) intention to request renewal of approval for an annual information collection on supplemental food security questions in the Current Population Survey (CPS), commencing with the December 2016 survey. These data will be used: To monitor household-level food security and food insecurity in the United States; to assess food security and changes in food security for population subgroups; to assess the need for, and performance of, domestic food assistance programs; to improve the measurement of food security; and to provide information to aid in public policy decision making.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by September 15, 2015 to be assured of consideration.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alisha Coleman-Jensen at the address in the preamble. Tel. 202–694–5456.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:


OMB Number: 0536–0043.

Expiration Date of Approval: January 31, 2016.

Type of Request: Intent To Seek Approval To Extend an Information Collection for 3 Years.

Abstract: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13) and OMB regulations at 5 CFR part 1320 (60 FR 44978, August 29, 1995), this notice announces the ERS intention to request renewal of approval for an annual information collection. The U.S. Census Bureau will supplement the December CPS, beginning in 2016, with questions regarding household food shopping, use of food and nutrition assistance programs, food sufficiency, and difficulties in meeting household food needs. A similar supplement has been appended to the CPS annually since 1995. The last collection was in December 2014.

ERS is responsible for conducting studies and evaluations of the Nation’s food and nutrition assistance programs that are administered by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), U.S. Department of Agriculture. In Fiscal Year 2014, the Department spent over $104 billion to ensure access to nutritious, healthful diets for all Americans. The Food and Nutrition Service administers the 15 food assistance programs of the USDA including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly called the Food Stamp Program, the National School Lunch Program, and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). These programs, which serve 1 in 4 Americans, represent our Nation’s commitment to the principle that no one in our country should lack the food needed for an active, healthy life. They provide a safety net to people in need. The programs’ goals are to provide needy persons with access to a more nutritious diet, to improve the eating habits of the Nation’s children, and to help America’s farmers by providing an outlet for the distribution of food purchased under farmer assistance authorities.

The data collected by the food security supplement will be used to monitor the prevalence of food security and the prevalence and severity of food insecurity among the Nation’s households. The prevalence of these conditions as well as year-to-year trends in their prevalence will be estimated at the national level and for population subgroups. The data will also be used to monitor the amounts that households spend for food and their use of community food pantries and emergency kitchens. These statistics along with research based on the data will be used to identify the causes and consequences of food insecurity and to assess the need for, and performance of, domestic food assistance programs. The data will also be used to improve the measurement of food security and to develop measures of additional aspects and dimensions of food security. This consistent measurement of the extent and severity of food insecurity will aid in policy decision-making.

The supplemental survey instrument was developed in conjunction with food security experts nationwide as well as survey method experts within the Census Bureau and was reviewed in 2006 by the Committee on National Statistics of the National Research Council. This supplemental information will be collected by both personal visit and telephone interviews in conjunction with the regular monthly CPS interviewing. Interviews will be conducted using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) and Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) methods.

Authority: Legislative authority for the planned data collection is H.R. 2642, Sec. 4023 (1) of the Agricultural Act of 2014. This section authorizes officials and contractors acting on behalf of the Secretary to cooperate with States, State agencies, local agencies, institutions, facilities such data consortia, and contractors to conduct program research and evaluations of programs authorized under the Agricultural Act.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this data collection is estimated to average 7.2 minutes (after rounding) for each household that responds to the labor force portion of the CPS. The estimate is based on the number of hours that are reported each question in recent survey years (2013 and 2014) and typical reading and response times for the questions.

Respondents: Individuals or households.

Estimated Total Number of Respondents: 53,657.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 6,450 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Alisha Coleman-Jensen at the address in the preamble.

Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) 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; (b) 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; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of