

- Introduction to GSA's Office of Federal High-Performance Green Buildings.
- Strategic partnerships for sustainable Federal buildings.
- Project discussions:
 - Energy Research into Practice.
 - High-Performance Green Building Demonstration Projects.
 - National Research Council "Levers for Change" Report and Expert Meetings.
 - Green Building Certification Systems review.
- 30 Minute public comment period for individuals pre-registered per instructions above. Each individual will be able to speak for 5 minutes.
- Next steps.
- Adjourn by 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Access: The Committee will convene its meeting at: One Constitution Square, 1275 First Street, NE., Room 201, Washington, DC 20417. Please allow time for a Security check prior to entering the building.

Dated: October 18, 2011.

A. Robert Flaak,

Director, Office of Committee and Regulatory Management, General Services Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011-27347 Filed 10-20-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-14-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[Notice: PBS-2011-02; Docket No. 2011-0006; Sequence 17]

Record of Decision Addendum for the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation at St. Elizabeths in Southeast, Washington, DC

AGENCY: National Capital Region, U.S. General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Record of Decision Addendum.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), GSA Order PBS P 1095.1F (Environmental considerations in decision-making, dated October 19, 1999), and the GSA Public Buildings Service NEPA Desk Guide, dated October 1999, on September 28, 2011, GSA issued a Record of Decision Addendum to the DHS Headquarters Consolidation at St. Elizabeths Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (GSA, November 2008), to implement the revised West Access Road from Firth Sterling Avenue to Gate 4 of the St.

Elizabeths West Campus. The complete Record of Decision Addendum can be viewed on the project Web site <http://www.stelizabethsdevelopment.com>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denise Decker, NEPA Lead, General Services Administration, National Capital Region, at (202) 538-5643.

Decision

It is the decision of the Regional Administrator of GSA, NCR, and in support of DHS, to approve the Addendum to the 2008 ROD and thereby implement the Preferred Alternative of the West Campus Access Road from Gate 4 to its intersection with Firth Sterling Avenue. This action is necessary as part of the redevelopment of the St. Elizabeths Campus associated with consolidating DHS headquarters. The Preferred Alternative includes intersection improvements at Firth Sterling Avenue resulting in a left-turn lane onto the West Campus Access Road, and construction of 10 bus bays along the West Campus Access Road.

The selection of the Preferred Alternative for the West Campus Access Road from Gate 4 to its intersection with Firth Sterling Avenue is conditioned on the following:

- Approval of the design for the West Campus Access Road by NCPC.
- Successful execution of the MOA regarding historic preservation signed by GSA, DC HPO, ACHP, FHWA, NCPC, and DHS in September 2011.
- Subsequent final determinations by DDOT on the Firth Sterling Avenue intersection with the West Campus Access Road. The Preferred Alternative could be implemented immediately after approval by DDOT.

Development of the West Campus Access Road will be guided by the Overall Development Phasing schedule included in the Master Plan Amendment and the PA. This decision is based on information and analyses contained in the following:

- 2008 Final Master Plan EIS and ROD.
- 2010 Draft Master Plan Amendment EIS.
- 2010 St. Elizabeths Transportation Technical Report.
- Comments from Federal and state agencies, stakeholder organizations, members of the public, elected officials, and other information in the project administrative record.

The proposed transportation improvements under the Preferred Alternative in this ROD Addendum, namely the West Campus Access Road from Gate 4 to Firth Sterling Avenue, do not conflict with the conclusions

presented in the 2008 Master Plan EIS and ROD.

Issued September 28, 2011 by Julia E. Hudson, Regional Administrator, General Services Administration, National Capital Region.

Dated: October 18, 2011.

Dawud Abdur-Rahman,

Director, Planning and Management, Office of Planning and Design Quality, General Services Administration, Public Building Services, National Capital Region.

[FR Doc. 2011-27349 Filed 10-20-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-23-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[30Day-12-11JD]

Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) publishes a list of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). To request a copy of these requests, call the CDC Reports Clearance Officer at (404) 639-5960 or send an e-mail to omb@cdc.gov. Send written comments to CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395-5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

Evaluation of Dating Matters: Strategies to Promote Healthy Teen Relationships™—New—National Center for Injury Prevention and Control—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Background and Brief Description

Evaluation of Dating Matters: Strategies to Promote Healthy Teen Relationships™ is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's new teen dating violence prevention initiative.

Recently, efforts to prevent teen dating violence (TDV) have grown, particularly in schools, among policymakers, and among sexual violence and domestic violence coalitions. Now many states and communities also are working to stop teen dating violence. However, these activities vary greatly in quality and effectiveness. To address the gaps, CDC has developed Dating Matters, a teen

dating violence prevention program that includes programming for students, parents, educators, as well as policy development. Dating Matters is based on the current evidence about what works in prevention and focuses on high-risk, urban communities where participants include: Middle school students age 11 to 14 years; middle school parents; brand ambassadors; educators; school leadership; program implementers; community representatives; and local health department representatives in the following four communities: Alameda County, California; Baltimore, Maryland; Broward County, Florida; and Chicago, Illinois.

The primary goal of the current proposal is to conduct an outcome and implementation evaluation of Dating Matters in the four metropolitan cities to determine its feasibility, cost, and effectiveness. In the evaluation a standard model of TDV prevention (Safe Dates which is administered in the 8th grade) will be compared to a comprehensive model (this model will be administered to students in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades). The comprehensive model also includes communications strategies, policy development, and programs involving parents of 6th, 7th, and 8th graders and their educators.

Burden estimates are based on the following information:

- *Number of communities/sites:* 4.
- *Number of schools across 4 communities/sites:* 48 (12 schools per community).
- *Number of students in each middle school:* 600 students—6th, 7th, 8th grade (200 students per grade).
- *Number of educators/school staff (e.g., teachers, principals, support staff) in each school:* 40.
- *Number of schools implementing the standard model of TDV prevention:* 24 (6 schools per community).
- *Number of schools implementing the comprehensive model of TDV prevention:* 24 (6 schools per community).

Across 4 communities/sites, 48 schools will implement the two models of teen dating violence prevention. Based on an anticipated school size of 600 the sampling frame for this data collection is 28,800 each year. The sampling frame for parents, given that we would only include one parent per student, is also 28,800. Based on our research and consultation with middle

schools, most schools with approximately 600 students have approximately 40 staff. If we assume 40 educators per school, the sampling frame for the educator sample is 1,920.

The following are explanations of estimated burden by respondent:

Students: We will use random selection to identify one-third of the total participants, which is 9,600 student participants per year.

Parents: We will attempt to recruit all parents participating in the parent curricula and select an equal number of parents from the standard of care schools to serve as a matched comparison group. We anticipate our final sample will include 40 parents per grade per school, with a total of (40 parents \times 48 schools \times 3 grades) 5,760 parents per year. This sample of parents will respond to surveys twice per year.

Educators: Although we will attempt to recruit all educators in each school (1,920) each year, we expect that 85 percent will participate, with the total number of 1,632 educator respondents per year.

School data extractors: We will attempt to recruit one data extractor per 48 schools to extract school data to be used in conjunction with the outcome data for the students. Individual level school data will only be collected for students participating in the evaluation (one-third of all students in each school or 200 students), so the number of respondents/extractors will be 48 and the number of responses per data extractor is 200.

School leadership: Based on the predicted number of one school leadership (e.g., principal, vice principal) per 48 schools, the number of respondents will be 48.

Local Health Department representative: Based on the predicted number of four communities/sites and four local health department representatives working on Dating Matters per community, the number of respondents will be 16.

Parent Program Manager: With a maximum of one parent program manager per community/site, the number of program manager respondents will be 4.

Community Representative: Based on the predicted number of 10 community representatives per 4 communities/sites, the number of respondents will be 40.

Parent Curricula Implementers: 6 schools from each community will

implement the comprehensive approach. Parent groups in the comprehensive approach are led by one male and one female parent. We have estimated 7 parent pairs per community with 56 total parent implementers (2 parents \times 7 parent pairs \times 4 communities = 56 implementers). These 56 implementers will host 5 sessions to 6th graders (280 respondents) and 3 sessions to 7th graders (168 respondents). It is anticipated that the parent curricula implementers will conduct three rounds of each curricula per year, with three responses per session log per year.

Student Curricula Implementers: There are six student curricula implementers per school that will be completing fidelity instruments (48 schools \times 6 implementers = 288 respondents). The 6th and 7th grade implementers will complete 6 program sessions each (288 \times 6 = 1,728 respondents) and the 8th grade implementers will complete 10 program sessions (288 \times 10 = 2,880 respondents). It is anticipated that the student curricula implementers will conduct one round of each curricula per year, with one response per session log per year.

Safe Dates Implementers: Based on the predicted number of 3 implementers in each of 48 schools, who will implement the 8th grade SafeDates program, the number of respondents for the Safe Dates implementer survey will be 144.

Brand Ambassadors: The Brand Ambassador Implementation Survey will be provided to each brand ambassador in each community. With a maximum of 20 brand ambassadors per community, the feedback form will be collected from a total of 80 brand ambassadors. Brand Ambassadors will respond to the survey twice per year.

Communications Implementers ("Brand Ambassador Coordinators"): The Communications Campaign Tracking form will be provided to each brand ambassador coordinator in each community. With a maximum of one brand ambassador coordinator per community (n = 4), the feedback form will be collected from a total of 4 brand ambassador coordinators.

There are no costs to the respondents other than their time. The total estimated annual burden hours are 60,182.

ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Type of respondent	Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden per response (hours)
Student Program Participant	Student Outcome Survey Baseline—Appendix D.	9600	1	1.5
Student Program Participant	Student Outcome Survey Follow-up—Appendix E.	9600	2	1.5
School data extractor	School Indicators—Appendix F	48	200	15/60
Parent Program Participant	Parent Outcome Survey—Appendix G	5760	2	1
Educator	Educator Outcome Survey—Appendix H	1632	1	30/60
Student Brand ambassador	Brand Ambassador Implementation Survey—Appendix I.	80	2	20/60
School leadership	School Leadership Capacity and Readiness Survey—Appendix J.	48	1	1
Parent Curricula Implementer (6th grade)	Parent Program Fidelity 6th Grade Sessions 1–5—Appendices K, L, M, N, O.	280	3	15/60
Parent Curricula Implementer (7th grade)	Parent Program Fidelity 7th Grade Sessions 1, 3–5—Appendices P, Q, R.	168	3	15/60
Safe Dates Implementer (implementation)	Safe Dates Implementation Survey—Appendix S.	144	1	1
Student Curricula Implementer (6th grade)	Student Program Fidelity 6th Grade Session 1–6—Appendices T, U, V, W, X, Y.	1728	1	15/60
Student Curricula Implementer (7th grade)	Student Program Fidelity 7th Grade Sessions 1–6—Appendices Z–EE.	1728	1	15/60
Student Curricula Implementer (8th grade)	Student Program Fidelity 8th Grade Sessions 1–10—Appendices FF–OO.	2880	1	15/60
Communications Implementer	Communications Campaign Tracking—Appendix PP.	4	4	20/60
Local health department representative	Local Health Department Capacity and Readiness—Appendix QQ.	16	1	2
Parent Program Manager	Parent Program Capacity and Readiness—Appendix RR.	4	1	1
Community Representative	Community Capacity and Readiness—Appendix SS.	40	1	1

Catina Conner,
Acting Reports Clearance Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
 [FR Doc. 2011–27245 Filed 10–20–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

[Document Identifier: CMS–10291 and CMS–10403]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, HHS.

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), Department of Health and Human Services, is publishing the following summary of proposed collections for public comment. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this

collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the Agency’s function; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

1. *Type of Information Collection Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection; *Title of Information Collection:* State Collection and Reporting of Dental Provider and Benefit Package Information on the Insure Kids Now! Web site and Hotline; *Use:* The Children’s Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (CHIPRA) sections 501(f)(1) and (2), requires that state-specific information on dental providers and benefits be posted on the Insure Kids Now (IKN) Web site and available on the hotline. States must update the information on the dental providers quarterly and the information on their benefit package annually. CMS is asking States to submit their dental benefits in a revised

format that is designed to reduce the amount of time States have to spend in compiling the dental benefit information. Although in the past we allowed States to only check a box to indicate that the Medicaid dental benefits were in compliance with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) services, we are also modifying the form to ask States to include their Medicaid dental benefits in this form so those may also be posted on the Web site. In addition, we are asking States to specify if they have a dollar or code limit at which point prior authorization is required for any additional services and if they have cost sharing requirements for dental services; *Form Number:* CMS–10291 (OMB #: 0938–1065); *Frequency:* Yearly (dental benefits) and quarterly (dental providers); *Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Governments; *Number of Respondents:* 51; *Total Annual Responses:* 255; *Total Annual Hours:* 190. (For policy questions regarding this collection contact Nancy Goetschius at 410–786–0707. For all other issues call 410–786–1326.)

2. *Type of Information Collection Request:* New collection; *Title of Information Collection:* Community-