

be less expensive than purchasing observer coverage to fish in GCAs, so this exemption would provide an incentive for vessels to participate in the EFP. This exemption would also allow NMFS to assess the feasibility of using EM and portside sampling to monitor midwater trawl herring trips fished in GCAs.

This EFP would also exempt participating vessels from season and area restrictions at § 648.202(b)(2) and (4) when operationally discarding catch. The EFP would authorize participating vessels to operationally discard catch in GCAs without triggering the consequence measures described at § 648.202(b)(4). Operational discards in the herring fishery are defined as “small amounts of fish that cannot be pumped on board and remain in the codend or seine at the end of pumping operations.” Midwater trawl vessels are permitted to operationally discard outside of GCAs without triggering consequence measures, but not inside GCAs. This exemption would allow participating vessels to maintain operational consistency inside and outside of GCAs. This exemption would also allow NMFS to collect additional information on the frequency of operational discards in GCAs. This exemption would not undermine conservation objectives because participating vessels would be fully monitored on 100 percent of trips and would be fully accountable for their catch in GCAs.

If approved, project partners may request minor modifications and extensions to the EFP throughout the year. EFP modifications and extensions may be granted without further notice if they are deemed essential to facilitate completion of the proposed research and have minimal impacts that do not change the scope or impact of the initially approved EFP request. Any fishing activity conducted outside the scope of the exempted fishing activity would be prohibited.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: March 25, 2020.

**Hélène M.N. Scalliet,**

*Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2020–06542 Filed 3–27–20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

## CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2019–0035]

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Consumer Product Risk Reduction Valuation Study: Cognitive Interviews & Focus Groups

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As required under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) announces that CPSC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a new proposed collection of information by the agency to conduct cognitive interviews and focus groups that will assess consumer comprehension of risk associated with consumer products. On December 30, 2019, the CPSC published a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the agency’s intent to seek approval of this collection of information. The CPSC received no comments in response to that notice. Therefore, by publication of this notice, the CPSC announces that it has submitted to the OMB a request for approval of this collection of information.

**DATES:** Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by May 29, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments about this request by email: [OIRA\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov) or fax: 202–395–6881. Comments by mail should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the CPSC, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503. In addition, written comments that are sent to OMB also should be submitted electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, under Docket No. CPSC–2019–0035.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bretford Griffin, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7037, or by email to: [BGriffin@cpsc.gov](mailto:BGriffin@cpsc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), federal agencies must obtain approval from OMB for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. “Collection of information” is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and

includes cognitive interviews and focus groups.

### A. Consumer Product Risk Reduction Valuation Study

CPSC is authorized under section 5(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), 15 U.S.C. 2054(a), to conduct studies and investigations relating to the causes and prevention of deaths, accidents, injuries, illnesses, other health impairments, and economic losses associated with consumer products. Section 5(b) of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2054(b), further provides that CPSC may conduct research, studies, and investigations on the safety of consumer products or test consumer products and develop product safety test methods and testing devices.

CPSC issues regulations to reduce the risk of fatal injuries or illnesses associated with the use of consumer products. To value reductions in the risk of fatalities, CPSC and other federal agencies rely on estimates of the value per statistical life (VSL), which are derived from research on individuals’ willingness to pay (WTP), consistent with the conceptual framework for benefit-cost analysis. Most of the studies on which these estimates are based calculate WTP by evaluating tradeoffs made by workers in risky occupations, and thus, concentrate on certain populations (working-age males). However, the type of risks and populations that are addressed by CPSC regulations often involve children. Although there are a few completed studies that address the value of risk reductions that accrue to children, the available literature is limited and largely unrelated to the types of risks addressed by CPSC rulemakings.<sup>1</sup> Due to the absence of children from labor markets and the lack of observable market data, the majority of the studies employ stated preference methods. That method asks individuals, usually through questionnaires, the economic value that they attach to a perceived risk, based on constructed or hypothetical markets. Although the existing studies suggest

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Alberini, A. and M. Ščasný. 2011. *Context and the VSL: Evidence from a Stated Preference Study in Italy and Czech Republic*. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 49(4): 511–538; Gerking, S., M. Dickie, and M. Veronesi. 2014. *Valuation of Human Health: An Integrated Model of WTP for Mortality and Morbidity Risk Reductions*. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 68(1): 20–45; Hammitt, J.K. and K. Haninger. 2010. *Valuing Fatal Risk to Children and Adults: Effects of Disease, Latency and Risk Aversion*. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 40: 57–83; Hammitt, J.K. and D. Herrera. 2017. *Peeling Back the Onion: Using Latent Class Analysis to Uncover Heterogeneous Responses to Stated Preference Surveys*. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, in press.

higher values for reducing risks to children than reductions to adults, they do not adequately determine the extent to which values for fatal risk reductions differ for adults versus children for risks associated with consumer products, nor do they adequately explain the level of respondent comprehension of relevant risk concepts.

CPSC seeks to conduct additional research to evaluate whether reductions in consumer product-related risks are valued differently when the beneficiary of the reduction is a child versus an adult. To assess comprehension of risk concepts, CPSC intends to conduct

qualitative pretesting, in the form of cognitive interviews and focus groups, based on best practices used in stated-preference study design. CPSC will conduct an initial set of eight cognitive interviews aimed specifically at topics related to risk communication and risk comprehension from homeowners with at least one child under the age of 12. Based on the results of the initial cognitive interviews, CPSC will inform OMB of any changes that are made for conducting a subsequent set of focus groups. Those focus groups will consist of 40 respondents and 16 additional cognitive interviews that will query the

respondents on fatal household risks related to consumer products. The interviews and focus groups are designed to assess respondents' comprehension of risk concepts and to inform the CPSC on the feasibility of developing a future survey instrument that will identify the best methods or approaches to communicate risk concepts related to consumer products.

**B. Burden Hours**

The estimated annual burden hours are as follows:

Activity	Number of responses	Estimated burden per respondent (hours)	Total burden (hours)
Cognitive Interviews I (Risk Communication and Comprehension) .....	8	1.5	12
Focus Group Sessions (Household Risks and Consumer Products) .....	40	2	80
Cognitive Interviews II (Household Risks and Consumer Products) .....	16	1.5	24
<b>Total</b> .....			<b>116</b>

We estimate the total annual dollar value of this collection to be \$4,265. This estimate is based on an average of \$36.77/hr. compensation, including benefits, from the National Compensation Survey published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employer Costs for Employee Compensation by ownership," Dec. 2018, Table 1, total compensation for civilian workers: <http://www.bls.gov/ncs/>). The total cost to the federal government for the contract to design and conduct the proposed survey is \$117,458.

**C. Submission to OMB**

Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)) requires federal agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. On December 30, 2019, the CPSC published a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the agency's intent to seek approval of this collection of information (84 FR 71902). The CPSC received no comments in response to that notice. Therefore, by publication of this notice, the CPSC announces that it has submitted to the OMB a request for approval of this collection of information.

**Alberta E. Mills,**

*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2020-06514 Filed 3-27-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6355-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**Department of the Air Force**

**Notice of Intent To Prepare a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of Cancellation of Scoping Meetings for the Proposed Extension of the Military Land Withdrawal at Barry M. Goldwater Range, Arizona**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Air Force and United States Marine Corps, Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Amended notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Air Force (USAF) (co-lead agency), in coordination with the United States Marine Corps (USMC) (co-lead agency), is issuing this amended notice to advise the public of the continuing intent to prepare a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) for the proposed extension of the Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR) land withdrawal and reservation in Arizona. The LEIS will also address a proposal to withdrawal approximately 2,366 acres of additional public land adjacent to Gila Bend Air Force Auxiliary Airfield to enhance the security and safety of flight operations at the airfield. However, as a direct result of the National Emergency declared by the President on Friday, March 13, 2020, in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in the United States and the Center for Disease Control's recommendations for social distancing

and avoiding large public gatherings, the Air Force is now canceling five public scoping meetings between April 9, 2020 and April 30, 2020. In lieu of the public scoping meetings, the Air Force will use the alternative means set forth below to inform the public and stakeholders and to obtain input for scoping the proposed action.

**ADDRESSES:** Information on the BMGR land withdrawal and the LEIS process can be accessed at the project website at [www.barry-m-goldwater-leis.com](http://www.barry-m-goldwater-leis.com). The project website can also be used to submit comments. In the alternative, interested persons may submit written comments by mail or email. For those who do not have ready access to a computer or the internet, the scoping-related materials posted to the website will be made available upon request by mail or phone. Inquiries, requests for scoping-related materials, and comments regarding the USAF/USMC proposal may be submitted by mail to BMGR Land Withdrawal LEIS, P.O. Box 2324, Phoenix, AZ 85003, or email to [BMGR\\_LEIS@jacobs.com](mailto:BMGR_LEIS@jacobs.com), or by phone to Mr. Jon Haliscak at 210-395-0615.

Written scoping comments will be accepted at any time during the environmental impact analysis process up until the public release of the Draft EIS. However, to ensure the Air Force and Marine Corps have sufficient time to consider public input in the preparation of the Draft LEIS, scoping comments must be submitted to the website or mailed to one of the