other pathogen, or any article similar to or allied with any of the foregoing.

APHIS has prepared an EA in which we present two alternatives based on our analysis of data submitted by GENECTIVE SA, a review of other scientific data, field tests conducted under APHIS oversight, and comments received on the petition. APHIS is considering the following alternatives: (1) Take no action, i.e., APHIS would not change the regulatory status of maize event VCO–01981–5 and it would continue to be a regulated article, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of maize event VCO–01981–5. The EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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 Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372). Based on our EA and other pertinent scientific data, APHIS has reached a preliminary FONSI with regard to the preferred alternative identified in the EA.

Based on APHIS’ analysis of field and laboratory data submitted by GENECTIVE SA, references provided in the petition, peer-reviewed publications, information analyzed in the EA, the PPRA, comments provided by the public, and discussion of issues in the EA in response to those public comments, APHIS has determined that maize event VCO–01981–5 is unlikely to pose a plant pest risk. We have therefore reached a preliminary decision to make a determination of nonregulated status of maize event VCO–01981–5, whereby maize event VCO–01981–5 would no longer be subject to our regulations governing the introduction of certain GE organisms.

We are making available for a 30-day review period APHIS’ preliminary regulatory determination of maize event VCO–01981–5, along with our PPRA, EA, and preliminary FONSI for the preliminary determination of nonregulated status. The EA, preliminary FONSI, PPRA, and our preliminary determination for maize event VCO–01981–5, as well as the GENECTIVE SA petition and the comments received on the petition, are available as indicated under ADDRESSES and FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT above. Copies of these documents may also be obtained from the person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT above. After the 30-day review period closes, APHIS will review and evaluate any information received during the 30-day review period. If, after evaluating the information received, APHIS determines that we have not received substantive new information that would warrant APHIS altering our preliminary regulatory determination or FONSI, substantially changing the proposed action identified in the EA, or substantially changing the analysis of impacts in the EA, APHIS will notify the public through an announcement on our Web site of our final regulatory determination. If, however, APHIS determines that we have received substantive new information that would warrant APHIS altering our preliminary regulatory determination or FONSI, substantially changing the proposed action identified in the EA, or substantially changing the analysis of impacts in the EA, then APHIS will notify the public of our intent to conduct additional analysis and to prepare an amended EA, a new FONSI, and/or a revised PPRA, which would be made available for public review through the publication of a notice of availability in the Federal Register. APHIS will also notify the petitioner.


Done in Washington, DC, this 19th day of July, 2013.

Kevin Shea,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–17937 Filed 7–25–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request—WIC Nutrition Services and Administration (NSA) Cost Study

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice invites the general public and other public agencies to comment on this proposed information collection. This collection is a new collection to obtain data on how State and local WIC agencies calculate NSA costs; how recent Program changes have impacted NSA costs; and how administrative costs and policies compare to those of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 24, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed data collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall 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 that were used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Written comments may be sent to: Dr. Melissa Abelev, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 1014, Alexandria, VA 22302. Comments may also be submitted via fax to the attention of Dr. Melissa Abelev at 703–305–2209 or via email to Melissa.Abelev@fns.usda.gov.

Comments will also be accepted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Go to http://www.regulations.gov, and follow the online instructions for submitting comments electronically.

All written comments will be open for public inspection at the office of the Food and Nutrition Service during regular business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday) at 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 1014, Alexandria, Virginia 22302.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval. All comments will be a matter of public record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Requests for additional information or copies of this information collection should be directed to Dr. Melissa Abelev at 703–305–2209.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Title: WIC Nutrition Services and Administration (NSA) Cost Study. Form Number: N/A.
provides low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and postpartum women, infants, and children up to age five with nutritious supplemental foods. The program also provides nutrition education and referrals to health and social services.

NSA costs, the focus of this study, are the direct and indirect costs, which State and local agencies determine to be necessary to support WIC Program operations, exclusive of food costs. NSA costs include, but are not limited to, the costs of Program administration, start-up, monitoring, auditing, the development of and accountability for food delivery systems, nutrition education and breastfeeding promotion and support, outreach, certification, and developing and printing food instruments and cash-value vouchers.

The current federal WIC regulations are designed to encourage women to breastfeed and to provide appropriate nutritional support for WIC participants. As part of these provisions, States must spend a minimum amount of grant funds, as determined by a national formula, on nutrition education and breastfeeding support services.

The last study on NSA costs took place in 2000. Since then, there have been many changes in the WIC Program—from new food packages, to the Value Enhanced Nutrition Assessment (VENA), to Management Information System (MIS) upgrades, and the start of the mandated conversion to Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards—all of which have impacted NSA costs. A census of state and local agencies will be conducted to provide insight into how NSA grant funds are used and have been impacted by recent changes. It will also provide a point of comparison with the administrative costs of other federal assistance programs by collecting data from state and local officials overseeing SNAP and TANF.

Data will be collected in four ways: (1) The collection of extant WIC State agency documents as summarized annually on FNS Forms 798 and 798–A (currently approved under 0584–0045); (2) a web survey of all WIC State and local agencies (preceded by a letter of introduction and recruitment); (3) key informant interviews with WIC administrators in 14 WIC State agencies plus interviews with 32 local agency directors within these State agencies; and (4) key informant interviews with state SNAP and TANF officials in nine jurisdictions plus interviews with two local SNAP/TANF agency officials (preceded by a letter of introduction and recruitment). A (4) informative interviews with WIC administrators in 14 WIC State agencies plus interviews with 32 local agency directors within these State agencies; and key informant interviews with state SNAP and TANF officials in nine jurisdictions plus interviews with two local SNAP/TANF agency officials (preceded by a letter of introduction and recruitment).

Affected Public: State, Local, and Tribal Government: Respondent groups identified include: All State WIC Directors; all local WIC agency Directors; selected State WIC Directors; selected local WIC agency Directors; selected state and local SNAP and TANF agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Burden</th>
<th>Estimated number respondent</th>
<th>Responses annually per respondent</th>
<th>Total annual responses (column b × c)</th>
<th>Estimated average number of hours per response</th>
<th>Estimated total hours (column d × e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State WIC Director Form 798/798–A Extant Data Request</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State WIC Director Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State WIC Director Web Survey</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SNAP Official Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SNAP Official Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State TANF Official Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State TANF Official Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local WIC Agency Director Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local WIC Agency Director Web Survey</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local WIC Agency Director Interview</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local SNAP Official Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local SNAP Official Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TANF Official Letter of Introduction and Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TANF Official Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reporting Burden</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>.666987</td>
<td>2,772.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Number of Respondents: The total estimated number of respondents is 4,156. This includes: 90 State WIC directors (extant data request); 90 State WIC directors (letter); 90 State WIC Directors (web survey); 14 State WIC directors (interview); 1,900 local WIC agency directors (letter); 1,900 local WIC agency directors (web survey); 32 local WIC agency directors (interview); 9 state SNAP agency officials (letter); 9 state SNAP agency officials (interview); 9 state TANF agency officials (letter); 9 state TANF agency officials (interview); one local SNAP agency official (letter); one local SNAP agency official (letter); one local SNAP agency official (letter); one local TANF agency official (letter); one local TANF agency official (letter).

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: All response tasks listed above require just one response each.

Estimated Total Annual Responses: 4,156.

Estimated Time per Response: The estimated time for each response is shown in the burden table below. Dividing the total hours of 2,772.00 by the 4,156 respondents (or responses) yields an average estimated time of .667 hours per response.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 2,772.00 hours. See the table following for estimated total annual burden for each type of respondent.
All written comments will be open for public inspection at the office of the Food and Nutrition Service during regular business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday) at 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 1014, Alexandria, VA 22302.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval. All comments will be a matter of public record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of this information collection should be directed to Steven Carlson at 703–305–2017.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title: Enhancing Completion Rates for SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) Quality Control Reviews. OMB Number: Not yet assigned. Expiration Date: Not yet determined.

Type of Request: New collection of information.

Abstract:

Section 17 [7 U.S.C. 2026] (a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, provides general legislative authority for the planned data collection. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with private institutions to undertake research that will help improve the administration and effectiveness of SNAP in delivering nutrition-related benefits.

States conduct monthly quality control (QC) reviews of a statistical sample of households participating in SNAP to assess the validity of SNAP cases and, ultimately, the error rate for SNAP. This requires completing as many reviews as possible. However, beginning in 1983, the completion rate of sampled QC reviews decreased nationally, reaching a low in FY 2006. The completion rate has increased somewhat since then, but not to previous levels. Completion rates vary considerably among States as well. This research will identify the factors associated with incomplete reviews in active SNAP cases and recommend ways to enhance completion rates for SNAP QC reviews.

Primary data collected from persons involved in conducting and monitoring the QC reviews and extant State administrative data, will be analyzed to compare information across the States; provide descriptive estimates of the contribution to payment error associated with incomplete reviews; and assess the need to adjust the current procedures for treating incomplete cases.

The information collection includes site visits at six State agencies, in-depth (semi-structured) interviews with SNAP QC staff during those site visits, and Web and telephone interviews with SNAP QC staff in the remaining 47 States not being visited. The SNAP QC director, up to two SNAP QC supervisors and up to five State QC reviewers from each State will be interviewed.¹

The specific research objectives are to: describe the process of conducting a QC review at the State and Federal levels; describe the characteristics of incomplete cases and compare them to complete cases using extant administrative case file data; describe the challenges and best practices in the QC review process at the State level; determine whether incomplete cases are being reviewed and processed correctly; determine the impact of incomplete cases on overall payment error; and determine the extent to which incomplete cases bias the data in the QC database.

Affected Public:

State Employees: Respondent groups identified include (1) State QC directors, if the position exists or State SNAP directors, in all 53 SNAP States; (2) State QC supervisors in 53 SNAP States, up to 2 per State (if more than 2 in a State, selected as a sample of convenience); and (3) State QC reviewers from 53 SNAP States, up to 5 per State (if more than 5 in a State, selected as a sample of convenience).

Estimated Number of Respondents:

The total estimated number of respondents is 424. This includes 53 State QC or State SNAP directors (1 in the pretest, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; 6 in person, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; and 46 online or by telephone, 78 percent of whom will complete surveys); 106 State QC supervisors (3 in the pretest, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; 12 in person, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; and 91 online or by telephone, 81 percent of whom will complete surveys); and 265 State QC reviewers (5 in the pretest, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; 30 in person, 100 percent of whom will complete interviews; and 230 online or by telephone, 81 percent of whom will complete surveys).

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:

¹ Additional information contributing to this research will be collected from FNS regional offices and staff acting in their official capacities (not subject to OMB approval) and SNAP participants sampled for QC with incomplete reviews (OMB approval previously granted for the QC Review Schedule (6584–0299) and Worksheet for QC Reviews (0284–0074)).