

## VI. Topics of Particular Interest To CNPP for Comment

Comments are welcomed on all aspects of the proposed Food Guidance System. CNPP has particular interest in receiving comments from the public on the following issues and questions:

A. *Advantages and disadvantages of retaining current shape for graphic and other potential shapes to use as a representative of the overall Food Guidance System.* The current graphic, the Food Guide Pyramid, has attained a high level of recognition among American consumers. The proposed new graphic is envisioned as a simplified symbol to represent the system but not provide detailed information. Is the high level of recognition that the pyramid shape has attained as a symbol of food guidance important in considering a shape for the new symbol? How is a pyramid shape viewed in relation to food guidance? How could USDA best capitalize on the recognition the original Pyramid has attained? Are there reasons that a different shape would be preferable? What other shapes or graphic ideas might better communicate dietary guidance messages?

B. *Usefulness of the proposed strategies to highlight both motivational/awareness and educational messages.* The proposed plan outlined in section III of this notice identifies both motivational/awareness elements and educational elements for the food guidance system. What are the pros and cons to implementing this strategy? How can these elements be designed to best complement each other? Would other strategies better communicate the multiple consumer messages of the food guidance system?

C. *Advantages and disadvantages of the plan to individualize guidance in contrast to "generalized" messages.* A major factor considered in the development of this proposed plan was that "one size" does not fit all for nutrition guidance. There are some universal messages such as the need for nutrients. However, with the rising incidence of obesity and overweight has come an increased need to focus on specific energy intake levels and therefore specific recommendations for types and amounts of food to consume. How can educational materials best be designed to provide this more specific guidance? What are the pros and cons of attempting to provide individualized rather than general guidance? What guidance messages are appropriate as general messages?

D. *Advantages and disadvantages of the planned focus on core messages in*

*contrast to use of a graphic to represent educational messages.* The original Pyramid graphic was successful in communicating several basic concepts. However, many consumers have not grasped specific concepts such as food group placement and amounts recommended to eat by viewing the graphic alone. Now, additional issues and messages are being proposed for incorporation into food guidance for consumers. Given the number and complexity of food guidance messages that must be communicated, CNPP has proposed that the graphic not be considered as an educational tool to communicate all of these messages. A framework containing core educational messages is envisioned for use in the development of all materials, with the graphic used to identify or "brand" these materials as part of the Food Guidance System. Is this plan feasible? Is it preferable to using the graphic to communicate essential food guidance messages? What advantages and disadvantages are there in using the graphic as a symbol to represent the system rather than as an educational tool?

E. *Key components for effective interactive educational tools.* The premise for the educational components of the new Food Guidance System is to help consumers improve their food choices through use of personalized guidance. CNPP envisions doing this through development of interactive educational tools accessible through the internet, on CD-ROMs, or other venues. What makes an effective personalized or interactive tool? What information should be provided to help consumers who seek only basic information on appropriate food choices and amounts? What information should be added for consumers that want to plan and assess their diets? What elements should be developed to help consumers personalize their diets? What caveats should be considered in developing individualized guidance?

F. *Channels of delivery for the Food Guidance System.* Once the new Food Guidance System is released, what are the most efficient and effective ways to reach consumers? Are internet-based and print educational materials most accessible to educators (information multipliers) and consumers? CNPP has proposed using the internet as one of the key channels for delivering Food Guidance System elements. Are there audiences that will not be able to access this information? What alternatives are available for reaching these audiences?

## VII. Public Disclosure and Availability of Comments

All comments submitted in response to this notice will be included in the record and will be made available to the public. Please be advised that the substance of the comments and the identities of the individuals or entities submitting the comments will be subject to public disclosure. CNPP plans to make the comments publicly available by posting a copy of all comments on the CNPP Web site at <http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/pyramid-update>.

Dated: July 2, 2004.

**Eric J. Hentges,**

*Executive Director, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion.*

[FR Doc. 04-15710 Filed 7-12-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 04-057-1]

### Notice of Request for Approval of an Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** New information collection; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's intention to initiate a new information collection activity to support the National Animal Health Monitoring System's national Poultry 2004 study.

**DATES:** We will consider all comments that we receive on or before September 13, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Please send four copies of your comment (an original and three copies) to Docket No. 04-057-1, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3C71, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. 04-057-1.

- *E-mail:* Address your comment to [regulations@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:regulations@aphis.usda.gov). Your comment must be contained in the body of your message; do not send attached files. Please include your name and address in your message and "Docket No. 04-057-1" on the subject line.

- *Agency Web Site:* Go to <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/cominst.html> for a form you can use to

submit an e-mail comment through the APHIS Web site.

**Reading Room:** You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690-2817 before coming.

**Other Information:** You may view APHIS documents published in the **Federal Register** and related information, including the names of groups and individuals who have commented on APHIS dockets, on the Internet at <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppd/rad/webrepor.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information on the national Poultry 2004 study, contact Mr. Chris Quatrano, Management Analyst, Centers for Epidemiology and Animal Health, VS, APHIS, 2150 Centre Avenue, Building B MS 2E6, Fort Collins, CO 80526-8117; (970) 494-7207. For copies of more detailed information on the information collection, contact Mrs. Celeste Sickles, APHIS' Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 734-7477.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Title:** National Animal Health Monitoring System, Poultry 2004.

**OMB Number:** 0579-XXXX.

**Type of Request:** Approval of a new information collection.

**Abstract:** The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture regulates the importation and interstate movement of animals and animal products, and conducts various other activities to protect the health of our Nation's livestock and poultry. Disease surveillance plays an important role in protecting the health of the U.S. livestock and poultry populations.

In connection with this mission, APHIS operates the National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS), which collects, on a national basis, statistically valid and scientifically sound data on the prevalence and economic importance of livestock and poultry diseases. Information from the studies conducted by NAHMS is disseminated to and used by livestock and poultry producers, consumers, animal health officials, private veterinary practitioners, animal industry groups, policymakers, public health officials, media, educational institutions, and others to improve the productivity and competitiveness of U.S. agriculture.

NAHMS' national studies have evolved into a collaborative industry and government initiative to help improve product quality and to determine the most effective means of producing animal and poultry products. APHIS is the only agency responsible for collecting national data on animal and poultry health. Participation in any NAHMS study is voluntary, and all data are confidential.

NAHMS will initiate a national study titled Poultry 2004 on premises with backyard flocks in the United States. Particular attention will be focused on Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. These 18 States account for 80 percent of broiler production, 74 percent of the layer inventory, and 85 percent of the turkeys raised. In addition, personal interviews will be conducted at live markets in the United States and a mail survey will also be sent to members of the United Gamefowl Breeders Association. The purpose of the study is to support the U.S. poultry industry by identifying potential disease transmission routes within backyard flocks and describing management practices related to control of disease spread. The potential benefits to the U.S. poultry industry include increased production through the identification of potential disease transmission vectors and enhanced management techniques.

The specific objectives of the Poultry 2004 study include the following: (1) Identify and describe the current population density of backyard poultry flocks around the commercial operations within States that account for a large proportion of U.S. poultry production; (2) assess current movement and handling practices among small and large producers that could potentially spread poultry disease; (3) identify common movement, biosecurity, and cleaning and disinfection practices at live bird markets; and (4) disseminate information on the benefits of proper biosecurity techniques to poultry owners.

We are asking the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the information collection activity for the national Poultry 2004 study.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit comments from the public (as well as affected agencies) concerning our information collection. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper

performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the information collection on those who are to respond, through use, as appropriate, of automated, electronic, mechanical, and other collection technologies, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

**Estimate of burden:** The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.42 hours per response.

**Respondents:** Backyard poultry owners within a 1-mile radius of a commercial poultry operation, members of the United Gamefowl Breeders Association, and live bird market managers.

**Estimated annual number of respondents:** 3,675.

**Estimated annual number of responses per respondent:** 1.

**Estimated annual number of responses:** 3,675.

**Estimated total annual burden on respondents:** 1,801 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 7th day of July, 2004.

**W. Ron DeHaven,**

*Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 04-15806 Filed 7-12-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. 04-059-1]

#### Notice of Request for Extension of Approval of an Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Extension of approval of an information collection; comment request.

---