

impacts of proposed major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment before taking that action. In accordance with NEPA, the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372) require that for each submitted petition, APHIS consider the potential environmental impacts of a request for nonregulated status either by preparing an environmental assessment (EA) or an EIS. APHIS has decided to prepare an EIS to better understand the degree of uncertainty for environmental impacts associated with the deregulation of ASR368. This uncertainty is primarily related to four issues that will be studied in the EIS: (1) Potential for hybridization and introgression, (2) management of volunteer ASR368, (3) potential effects on weed management practices, and (4) potential inter-related trade and economic impacts. The EIS will examine the broad and cumulative environmental impacts of the requested deregulation of ASR368, including potential impacts of the proposed action on the human environment and alternative courses of action.

Alternatives

The Federal action being considered is whether to approve the petition for nonregulated status of ASR368. This notice identifies reasonable alternatives and potential issues that may be studied in the EIS. We are requesting public input and comment on the range of alternatives, and on the environmental impacts and issues stated in this NOI as well as suggestions for additional alternatives for consideration and new impacts or issues to be evaluated in the EIS for the petition.

The EIS will consider a range of reasonable alternatives. APHIS is currently considering two alternatives: (1) Take no action, *i.e.*, APHIS would not change the regulatory status of the glyphosate-resistant creeping bentgrass event ASR368 and such plants would continue to be regulated articles, or (2) approve the petition for determination of nonregulated status of ASR368.

Environmental Issues for Consideration

We have identified the following potential environmental issues for consideration in the EIS: Impacts on managed natural and non-agricultural lands; on agricultural production systems; on the physical environment; on biological resources; on human health; on socioeconomic issues; on

federally listed threatened or endangered species; and on cultural or historic resources. In addition to providing input and comment on these issues, we are also requesting that the public provide information on the following questions during the comment period:

Potential for Hybridization and Introgression

- What are the weed species in potential affected environments with which ASR368 may hybridize and introgress? What evidence is there that this would or could occur?
- If introgression was to occur, would the inability to identify introgression of ASR368 lead to stand failures or increasing costs for production of grass seed crops when compared to non-genetically engineered (non-GE) creeping bentgrass? What evidence is there that would support stand failure or increased costs.

Management of Volunteer ASR368

- Compared to non-GE creeping bentgrass and other grasses, would deregulation of ASR368 result in its establishment and persistence in situations where it is unwanted, unintended, or unexpected (*e.g.*, agricultural irrigation canals, habitat restoration, riparian areas, wetlands, or grasslands)?
- When compared to non-GE creeping bentgrass, could the spread of ASR368 or its relatives to areas where it is unwanted, unintended, or unexpected potentially result in adverse effects on native species or habitats, including threatened and endangered species and their habitats? What supporting information is available to conclude an adverse effect?

Potential Effects on Weed Management Practices

- Would the presence of volunteer ASR368 increase the costs and complexity of weed control for growers of non-GE creeping bentgrass and other crops? What evidence is there to support this conclusion?
- What potential changes of agronomic practices may occur as a result of the presence of ASR368 agricultural crops, including crop rotation practices, herbicide use, and tillage?

Potential Trade and Economic Impacts

- What potential impacts on GE-free grass seed exports could result from the presence of ASR368?
- What potential impacts on conventional and organic crops could result from the presence of ASR368?

Comments that identify other issues or alternatives that should be considered for examination in the EIS would be especially helpful. All comments received during the scoping period will be carefully considered in developing the final scope of the EIS. Upon completion of the draft EIS, a notice announcing its availability and an opportunity to comment on it will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7701–7772 and 7781–7786; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 27th day of July 2016.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–18421 Filed 8–2–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2016–0046]

Secretary's Advisory Committee on Animal Health; Intent To Renew

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: We are giving notice that the Secretary of Agriculture intends to renew the charter for the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Animal Health for a 2-year period. The Secretary has determined that the Committee is necessary and in the public interest.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Diane L. Sutton, Designated Federal Officer, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 43, Riverdale, MD 20737; (301) 851–3509.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA, 5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given that the Secretary of Agriculture intends to renew the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Animal Health (the Committee) for 2 years. The term for the renewed charter will extend from August 8, 2016, to August 7, 2018.

The Committee advises the Secretary on strategies, policies, and programs to prevent, control, or eradicate animal diseases. The Committee considers agricultural initiatives of national scope and significance and advises on matters of public health, conservation of national resources, stability of livestock economies, livestock disease management and traceability strategies, prioritizing animal health imperatives,

and other related aspects of agriculture. The Committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson are elected by the Committee from among its members.

Done in Washington, DC, this 27th day of July 2016.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-18341 Filed 8-2-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS-2012-0103]

Privacy Act Systems of Records; Veterinary Services—Records of Accredited Veterinarians

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service proposed to alter an existing system of records in its inventory of record systems subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. The system of records is Veterinary Services—Records of Accredited Veterinarians, USDA—APHIS-2. The system, as proposed, has been adopted; however, we received one comment, which is addressed in this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Todd Behre, Program Coordinator, National Veterinary Accreditation Program, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 200, Riverdale, MD 20737; (518) 281-2157.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a), requires agencies to publish in the *Federal Register* notice of new or revised systems of records. A system of records is a group of any records under the control of any agency, from which information is retrieved by the name of an individual or by some identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to an individual.

On May 12, 2015, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) published in the *Federal Register* (80 FR 27142-27145, APHIS-2012-0103)¹ a proposal to alter a system of records, entitled Veterinary Services—Records of Accredited

Veterinarians, which maintains information pertaining to veterinarians who are or have been accredited, or who have applied for accreditation, under the authority of section 10410 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8309).

Accredited veterinarians are veterinarians authorized by APHIS to perform certain services to control and prevent the spread of animal diseases within the United States and internationally. Duties may encompass a wide range of activities relating to companion animals, livestock, poultry, horses, and other animals, including issuing certificates of veterinary inspection and health certificates for animals moving interstate or internationally; participating in animal disease surveillance and testing activities (including surveillance for emerging and foreign animal diseases); diagnosing diseases in animals; developing herd or flock health plans; and performing veterinary tasks during animal disease emergencies.

Veterinarians who wish to perform work for APHIS must become nationally accredited by APHIS and then authorized by APHIS to perform accredited duties in one or more specific States or territories.

In order to ensure that a veterinarian's accreditation is in good standing and that he or she has received the appropriate level of training commensurate with his or her duties, APHIS maintains information regarding the veterinarian in the Veterinary Services—Records of Accredited Veterinarians system. APHIS maintains information about accredited veterinarians in the system in accordance with the APHIS Records Management Handbook. Data associated with accredited veterinarians (including those whose accreditation has lapsed or been revoked) will be destroyed when 45 years old. Data will also be destroyed when the accredited veterinarian is deceased. The system also contains information about veterinarians who are applicants for accredited status.

The system contains records related to the accreditation status of veterinarians. The records include name; date of birth; business name; home and business mailing addresses, telephone numbers, and email address; type of employment; State in which licensed or legally able to practice veterinary medicine; veterinary license number; veterinary medical college graduated and date of graduation; State(s) in which the veterinarian is authorized to perform accredited duties; species of animals the veterinarian treats; primary medical discipline; date of core orientation to

accreditation and State where the veterinarian completed the orientation; the veterinarian's accreditation category; date of accreditation renewal; APHIS program certifications; APHIS-approved supplemental training completed; whether business contact information may be provided to members of the public; and information pertaining to any alleged or adjudicated violations of accreditation standards, including disposition of the case. The system also assigns a national accreditation number (NAN) to each registered accredited veterinarian.

We solicited comments on the notice for 30 days ending on June 22, 2015. We received one comment by that date from an organization that represents veterinarians. The commenter objected to the use of dates of birth in the system. The commenter stated that the use of the date of birth was unnecessary and could present a vulnerability to personal identity security.

We disagree with the commenter that the use of the date of birth is unnecessary. To the contrary, the date of birth is a necessary identifier. In fact, there are three main reasons for the use of the date of birth to maintain records of accredited veterinarians.

As previously indicated, the system includes records for each accredited veterinarian, several of these, when listed together, are considered unique identifiers, such as the full name (first and last names and middle initial), date of birth, school and year of graduation, and the system-generated NAN. In some instances accredited veterinarians with the same full name also have the same year and school of graduation. In addition, some accredited veterinarians do not remember their NAN, which consists of a six-digit number that uses leading 0's. Some relay their NAN incorrectly by superimposing numbers, not using the leading 0's, etc. In these cases, the date of birth is used as the most accurate identifier.

The date of birth is also used when we find that an accredited veterinarian has a duplicate record in the database, which means there were two separate NANs created. The date of birth is the single unique identifier used to ensure that the two records do in fact belong to the same person, in which case, we combine the records under one NAN.

Lastly, we conduct classroom training sessions at major and local veterinary meetings. Attendance at training sessions is required for an accredited veterinarian to renew his or her accreditation, and each accredited veterinarian must sign in using his or her first name, last name, and date of birth as identifiers. We require the date

¹ To view the notice and the comment we received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=APHIS-2012-0103>.