

goods at ports of entry into the United States. We have determined that it is no longer appropriate or necessary to take such action on some plant pests on which we had been taking action at ports of entry because we are not taking any regulatory action on those same pests when we find them in interstate movement, due to our scientific determination that we do not need to mitigate their pest risk. This process relieves restrictions that are no longer needed and ensures that actions taken on plant pests found in imported goods are consistent with the actions we take on those same pests when they appear in interstate commerce.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David B. Lamb, Regulatory Policy Specialist, RPM, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; (301) 851-2018; or Ms. Diane L. Schuble, National Coordinator for Official Control, Pest Detection and Emergency Programs, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737-1237; (301) 851-2334.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Plant Protection Act, as amended (PPA, 7 U.S.C. 7701 *et seq.*), the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to take such actions as may be necessary to prevent the introduction and spread of plant pests within the United States. The Secretary has delegated this responsibility to the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

Pursuant to the PPA, when the Secretary considers it necessary to prevent the dissemination of a plant pest that is new to or not known to be widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States, the Secretary may hold, seize, quarantine, treat, apply other remedial measures to, destroy, or otherwise dispose of any plant, plant pest, noxious weed, biological control organism, plant product, article, or means of conveyance that, among other things, is moving into the United States and that the Secretary has reason to believe is infested with a plant pest at the time of the movement. Under this PPA authority, consignments of imported articles are inspected at the port of entry to determine whether plant pests are associated with them and, if so, prescribe remedial measures as described in the Act. APHIS typically refers to prescribing measures to address the pest risk as “taking action” at the port of entry to prevent a plant pest from being introduced into or further disseminated within the United States. Pests that are subject to such actions are referred to as “actionable pests.”

APHIS determines whether a pest is actionable based on its novelty and known prevalence or distribution within and throughout the United States, its potential harm to U.S. agricultural, environmental, or other resources, and the need to mitigate its pest risk, if any. However, after APHIS determines that a pest is actionable, circumstances may change, and it may no longer be necessary or be an effective use of resources to take action on the pest at ports of entry. For example, a bacterium could cause disease in a plant, but also could have become widespread in the United States, making any future control efforts ineffective and a waste of limited resources. We may lack effective control methods for an insect pest that is present in the United States, which would result in taking action that will likely not prevent the pest from causing damage but will continue to expend limited resources. Or, for example, a mealybug could damage certain plants, but additional experience with the pest may reveal that the damage is not of sufficient plant pest risk or economic importance to merit action at the port of entry. These circumstances often mean that no restrictions are placed on the interstate movement of articles infested with these pests when the articles are moved interstate. It is important to make the actions we take at the port of entry consistent with the actions taken in interstate movement, to maintain a uniform and consistent pest risk safeguarding and trade policy.

To ensure that we are taking action at the ports of entry only when such action is warranted, APHIS has started to assess currently actionable plant pests that are present in the United States to determine which specific pests we should continue to take action on at the port of entry. The assessment is based on a number of factors, including:

- The extent of the pest’s distribution in the United States;
- The pest’s impacts on the economy (including its potential impacts on export markets), agricultural production, and the environment;
- The scientific knowledge we have about the pest and the risk it poses; and
- The availability and effectiveness of control or eradication tools for the pest.

After we have completed our assessment, we share the information with the National Plant Board, a group of State plant health agencies. The States conduct their own reviews and provide additional information to help inform APHIS’ decisionmaking. For example, States may have additional information on the presence or distribution of a pest in their States, on

the damage that pest causes, or potential control tools.

After reviewing the information provided by the States, APHIS makes a decision on whether to continue taking action at ports of entry to mitigate the risk associated with a specific plant pest. Data leading to the decisions are documented in letters that are available on the Web at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/frsmp/non-reg-pests.shtml. As of September 2013, APHIS has determined that 71 pests on which we had been taking action at ports of entry to address their risk no longer qualify under the PPA as requiring such action.

Done in Washington, DC, this 6th day of November 2013.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013-27132 Filed 11-12-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS-2013-0007]

Notice of Affirmation of Addition of a Treatment Schedule for Methyl Bromide Fumigation of Blueberries

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are affirming our earlier determination that it was necessary to immediately add to the Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual a treatment schedule for methyl bromide fumigation of blueberries for Mediterranean fruit fly and South American fruit fly. In a previous notice, we made available to the public for review and comment a treatment evaluation document that described the new treatment schedule and explained why we have determined that it is effective at neutralizing these fruit flies.

DATES: *Effective Date:* Effective on November 13, 2013, we are affirming the addition to the Plant Protection and Quarantine Treatment Manual of the treatment described in the notice published at 78 FR 36507-36508 on June 18, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Inder P.S. Gadh, Senior Risk Manager-Treatments, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737; (301) 851-2018.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The regulations in 7 CFR chapter III are intended, among other things, to prevent the introduction or dissemination of plant pests and noxious weeds into or within the United States. Under those regulations, certain plants, fruits, vegetables, and other articles must be treated before they may be moved into the United States or interstate. The phytosanitary treatments regulations in part 305 of 7 CFR chapter III set out standards for treatments required in parts 301, 318, and 319 of 7 CFR chapter III for fruits, vegetables, and other articles.

In § 305.2, paragraph (b) states that approved treatment schedules are set out in the Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Treatment Manual.¹ Section 305.3 sets out a process for adding, revising, or removing treatment schedules in the PPQ Treatment Manual. In that section, paragraph (b) sets out the process for adding, revising, or removing treatment schedules when there is an immediate need to make a change. The circumstances in which an immediate need exists are described in § 305.3(b)(1). They are:

- PPQ has determined that an approved treatment schedule is ineffective at neutralizing the targeted plant pest(s).
- PPQ has determined that, in order to neutralize the targeted plant pest(s), the treatment schedule must be administered using a different process than was previously used.
- PPQ has determined that a new treatment schedule is effective, based on efficacy data, and that ongoing trade in a commodity or commodities may be adversely impacted unless the new treatment schedule is approved for use.
- The use of a treatment schedule is no longer authorized by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or by any other Federal entity.

In accordance with § 305.3(b), we published a notice² in the **Federal Register** on June 18, 2013 (78 FR 36507–36508, Docket No. APHIS–2013–0007), announcing our determination that a new methyl bromide treatment schedule to mitigate risk from two fruit fly species, *Ceratitidis capitata* (Mediterranean fruit fly) and *Anastrepha fraterculus* (South

American fruit fly) is effective, based on evidence presented in a treatment evaluation document (TED) we made available with the notice. We also determined that the ongoing trade of blueberries would be adversely impacted unless the new treatment schedule is approved for use. The treatment was added to the PPQ Treatment Manual, but was subject to change or removal based on public comment.

We solicited comments on the notice for 60 days ending August 19, 2013. We received no comments by that date. Therefore, in accordance with the regulations in § 305.3(b)(3), we are affirming our addition of a methyl bromide treatment schedule to mitigate risk from *C. capitata* and *A. fraterculus*, as described in the TED made available with the previous notice. The treatment schedule is numbered T101-i-1–2. The treatment schedule will be listed in the PPQ Treatment Manual, which is available as described in footnote 1 of this document.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7701–7772 and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 6th day of November 2013.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–27134 Filed 11–12–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Notice of Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Rural Business-Cooperative Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed collection; comments requested.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Rural Business-Cooperative Service's intention to request an extension for a currently approved information collection in support of the program for 7 CFR part 4284, subpart G, Rural Business Opportunity Grant Program.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by January 13, 2014 to be considered.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Chad Parker, Deputy Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, USDA, Room 4016–South, MS 3252, 1400 Independence Ave. SW.,

Washington, DC 20250. Telephone: (202) 720–7558, Email chad.parker@wdc.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Rural Business Opportunity Grants.

OMB Number: 0570–0024.

Expiration Date of Approval: March 31, 2014.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: The objective of the Rural Business Opportunity Grant (RBOG) program is to promote sustainable economic development in rural areas. This purpose is achieved through grants made by the Rural Business-Cooperative Service (RBS) to public bodies, non-profit corporations, Indian Tribes on Federal or State reservations and other Federally-recognized tribal groups, and cooperatives whose members are primarily rural residents to pay costs of economic development planning and technical assistance for rural businesses. The regulations contain various requirements for information from grant applicants and recipients. The information requested is necessary for RBS to be able to process applications in a responsible manner, make prudent program decisions, and effectively monitor the grantees' activities to ensure that funds obtained from the Government are used appropriately. Objectives include gathering information to determine the eligibility and financial capability of the applicant, to determine the eligibility of the proposed use of funds, to assess the quality of the project for evaluation and grant selection, and to monitor grantees to ensure funds are used in accordance with approved scopes of work and applicable laws and regulations.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 7.4 hours per response.

Respondents: Public bodies, non-profit corporations, Indian Tribes on Federal and State reservations and other Federally-recognized tribal groups, and cooperatives whose members are primarily rural residents.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 267.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 9.

Estimated Number of Responses: 1971.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 17,842.25.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Jeanne Jacobs, Regulations and Paperwork Management Branch, (202) 692–0040.

¹ The Treatment Manual is available on the Internet at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/manuals/index.shtml or by contacting the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine, Manuals Unit, 92 Thomas Johnson Drive, Suite 200, Frederick, MD 21702.

² To view the notice and the treatment evaluation document, go to <http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=APHIS-2013-0007>.