Competitive, Special and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i); Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP)—(Section 2(c)(1)(A) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act, (Pub. L. No. 89–106), as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(1)(A)); Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program (RIPM)—(Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (Pub. L. No. 89–106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(1)(B)) and Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)); Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support (EIPM-CS)—(Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d) as amended by Section 7403 of the FCEA) (Pub. L. 110–246), and the Regional IPM Centers—(Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (AREERA) (7 U.S.C. 7626), as reauthorized by Section 7306 of the FCEA of 2008) (Pub. L. 110–246)). The Crop Protection Program, as proposed, would be authorized under Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (AREERA) (7 U.S.C. 7626), as reauthorized by Section 7306 of the FCEA (Pub. L. 110–246). This funding authority will allow eligibility for four-year degree granting institutions and provide for the recovery of indirect costs. The intent of the listening sessions is to gather stakeholder input on program focus, function and design. Additional detail can be found in the explanatory notes to the President’s budget, found at http://www.obpa.usda.gov/17nifa2013notes.pdf. USDA–NIFA suggests the following questions be addressed in drafting comments on the program. Prior to the listening session, National Program Leaders presented stakeholders with the following questions:

1. What conceptual elements are needed in the new CPP to address research education and extension in pest management to ensure global food security and other major societal challenges are addressed?

2. Is regionalization a sound concept for coordination of IPM programs? Why or why not?

3. What administrative functions are needed to adequately manage elements of the new program?

4. Should the program be delivered through a state, regional, or national structure or should there be a blend of elements to address regional and national interests?

5. How should resources be apportioned across the functional areas and across regions if regionalization is an element of the program?

6. If regional program delivery is a part of the concept, what critical benefits does this approach provide?

7. If a regional structure is deployed, what should it look like?

8. Should the CPP be limited to short-term projects or should longer-term ongoing programs also be supported?

9. What size should the awards be for research, education or extension? What scope should projects encompass?

10. What portion of the Crop Protection Program budget should be dedicated to each of the five IPM program areas: (a) Plant Protection Tactics and Tools; (b) Diversified IPM Systems; (c) Enhancing Agricultural Biosecurity; (d) IPM for a Sustainable Society; and (e) Development of the Next Generation of IPM Scientists.

The March, April and May 2012, Listening Sessions are scheduled to assist NIFA leadership in more fully addressing stakeholder needs and assuring that the CPP has influence on the discovery of new IPM knowledge, IPM principles are adopted, and end users are best served.

Implementation Plans

NIFA plans to consider stakeholder input received from these public meetings as well as other written comments in developing the FY 2013 program guidelines, dependent on Congressional appropriation. NIFA anticipates releasing the proposed FY 2013 RFA(s) by winter 2012–13.

Dated: Done at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of March 2012.

Chavonda Jacobs-Young,
Acting Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The focus of the meeting will be reports and updates on programs and research projects affecting the Arctic.

If you plan to attend this meeting, please notify us via the contact information below. Any person planning to attend who requires special accessibility features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission of those needs in advance of the meeting.

Contact person for further information: John Farrell, Executive Director, U.S. Arctic Research Commission, 703–525–0111 or TDD 703–306–0090.

John Farrell,
Executive Director.
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BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Requirements for Approved Construction Investments

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration (EDA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, as amended.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before June 4, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at jessup@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to John Cobb, Program Analyst, Office of Regional Affairs, Room 7009, Economic Development Administration, Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482–0951, facsimile (202) 482–2838 (or via the Internet at John.f.cobb@eda.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: